Paid to typist

Rs 30 -	5th April
50	5th May
50	6th June
50	10th July
50	9th August
230	

only 100 more to be paid

Sukra 131-) describes graphically the advantages to be derived from travelling & coming into contact with scholars of diff lands.

आचार्यात्पादमादत्ते पादं शिष्यः स्वमेधया
पादं सब्रह्मचारिभ्यः पादं कालक्रमेण तु - सुभाषितम्

5 Copies

Anandavardhana's श्वेत श्री के साक्षिण: etc seems to be echoed in the Narasimha Purana मङ्गलाचरण - तप्तहाटककेशाय ज्वलत्पावकलोचन: । वज्राधिकनखस्पर्श दिव्यसिंहं नमोस्तु ते
v पातु वो नरसिंहस्य नखलाङ्गूलकोटय: । हिरण्यकशिपोर्वक्षस्यङ्कुर्दारुणा: ॥
होमभस्माग्निन: सर्वे मुनयो वेदपारगा: । त्रिकालज्ञा महात्मानो नैमिशारण्यवासिन:

"BHĀSA or STUDIES"

"Bhasa's Thought and Language" (Part I).

by

Sri Udupi Venkatakrishna Rao

Professor of Samskrit

Madras Christian College,

Tambaram.

सर्वस्याप्त्यै सर्वस्य जित्यै सर्वमेवाप्नोति

सर्वं जयति -

At the end of X.85 (VIII. 3.28) the following verses occurs:

अविधवा भव वर्षाणि शतं साग्रं तु सुव्रते।
तेजस्वी यशस्वी च धर्मपत्नी पतिव्रता।
जनयस्व बहून् पुत्रान् मा च दुःखं लभेत्क्वचित्।
भर्ता ते सोमपा नित्यं भवेद्धर्मपरायणः॥
अष्टपुत्रा भव त्वं च सुभगा च पतिव्रता
भर्तुश्चैव पितुर्भ्रातुर्हृदयानन्दिनी सदा॥
इन्द्रस्य तु यथेन्द्राणी श्रीधरस्य यथा श्रिया।
शंकरस्य यथा गौरी तद्भर्तुरपि भर्तरि॥
अत्रेर्यथानुसूया स्याद्वसिष्ठस्याप्यरुन्धती।
कौशिकस्य यथा सती तथा त्वमपि भर्तरि॥
ध्रुवैधि पोष्या मयि मह्यं त्वादाद्बृहस्पतिः।
मया पत्या प्रजावती सं जीव शरदः शतम्॥

Jāranatha writes that the great Monastery near Lhasa with 7700 monks and a University with 6 Colleges was built after the model of a monastery at Dhanyakataka in the early centuries.

संज्ञानमुशना वदत्संज्ञानं वरुणोऽवदत्।
संज्ञानमिन्द्रश्चाग्निश्च संज्ञानं सविता वदत्॥
संज्ञानं वः स्वेभ्यः संज्ञानमरणेभ्यः।
संज्ञानमश्विना युष्मिहास्मासु नि यच्छतम्॥
यत्कक्षीवन्त्संवननो पुत्रो अङ्गिरसामवे।
तेन नोऽद्य विश्वे देवाः सं प्रियं समजीजनत्॥
सं वो मनांसि जानतां समाकूतिर्मनामसि।
अमी ये विमना जनास्तान् समा कर्तयामसि॥
तच्छं योरा वृणीमहे गातुं यज्ञाय गातुं यज्ञपतये।
दैवी स्वस्तिरस्तु नः स्वस्तिर्मानुषेभ्यः
ऊर्ध्वं जिगातु भेषजं। शं नो अस्तु द्विपदे शं चतुष्पदे॥

XII - Kautilya and Bhasa, a) अनुबंध b) श्राद्ध cult

XIII - Bhasa and Mahendravikramavarman (as in the thesis)

XIV. Bhasa and Saktibhadra (as in the thesis

XV Lapsus Linguae - Slips of the tongue (the thesis

XVI Bhasa and Fine arts (the thesis

XVII Bhasa's Madhyama (,,

XVIII The unspoken word in Bhasa ,,

XIX Wit and humour in Bhasa ,,

XX Bhasa's vindications ,,

XXI Visions in Bhasa ,,

XXII Indian womanhood ,,

XXIII Charudatta & Mrcchakatika ,,

XXIV Bhasa and Damaka Prahasana

संसारोऽस्ति न तत्त्वतस्तनुभृतां बन्धस्य वास्तैव को
बन्धो यस्य न जीवतस्य वितथा मुक्तस्य मुक्तिः क्रिया।
मिथ्या मोहकृदेष रज्जुभुजगच्छाया पिशाचभ्रमो
मा किञ्चिच्छ्रयत मा गृहाण विलस स्वस्थो यथास्थितः

अभिनवगुप्त

BHASA STUDIES.

Pages

Chapter I a) Bhasa's date - 1
b) The chronology of the dramas - 9
II - His authorship of the 13 plays & testimonies thereon - 12

See slip written

III. Jivalana mitra tradition. - 21

IV Some criticisms considered. - 24

V. Bhasa and his early affiliations. - 38

VI. More peculiarities of Bhasa. - 51

VII Valmiki and Bhasa. - 60

VIII Vedavyasa and Bhasa. - 70

IX Bharata and Bhasa - 79

X ~~Vatsyāyana~~ वात्स्यायन and Bhasa. - 97.

XI Kautilya and Bhāsa 120
a) अनुवाद in Bhāsa. - 140

XII ~~Vātsyāyana and~~ Bhasa.
b) श्राद्ध cult in Bhāsa. - 160

XIII Viṣṇu Purāṇa and Bhāsa. - 106

XIV Bhasa and Guṇādhya. - 183
(Separate essay.

PART I BHASA Studies.

Chapter I - Bhasa's date.

Gaṇeśvaram namaskurve siddhidāyakasattaman
tamasāmvighnarūpāṇām pralayaḥ smṛtimātrataḥ

The epochmaking discovery of these so-
called Trivandrum dramas in 1913 was
hailed by scholars with great joy; it was
also ridiculed by another section of equally
learned scholars. Some scholars like Pisharodi
who were ardent admirers in the beginning
have since set their face against Mahāmahopādhyaya
Ganapati Sastriyar ~~now~~ and are vehemently
denouncing him. But Pandit Ganapati Sastri's
"alluring theory has in the meantime made
fresh conquests and found new admirers" as Dr.
V. S. Sukthankar has remarked. Opinion is very
sharply divided between those who ascribe
these dramas to the time-honoured Bhāsa, referred

to as Prathitayaśas by Kālidāsa and those who ascribe them to an unknown poetaster who has usurped a time honoured name. ~~forgotten by posterity~~. If some scholars believe that these dramas were written by Bhāsa the reputed predecessor of Kālidāsa and Bāṇa, other equally strongly assert that they do not possess such high excellences and that they must have been composed by a plagiarist perhaps later than the 7th century A.D. Certain scholars are prepared to concede that these dramas might contain some of those excellences since they should be taken to represent stage-adaptations of the once-famous dramas which are irrevocably lost.

Wherever the truth may lie, the popularity of these dramas is attested by their innumerable translations into all the North and South Indian languages like Bengali, Gujerati, Marathi, Hindi and all the Dravidian languages. Some like the Svapna Vāsavadatta have been trans-

- latter into German, French and Italian, Avimāraka into German and Italian, Cārudatta and Madhyama-Vyāyoga into Norwegian, Urubhanga and Bāla-charita into German, Abhiseka into Italian — Dr Sukthankar supplied these statistics nearly 30 years ago: and it is no wonder that the number of these foreign adaptations or translations will go on increasing. It cannot be denied that these dramas are very vigorous and eminently stageworthy, unlike the usual dramas we meet with in Sanskrit literature. As such they are eminently worthy of a careful and reverential study. Dr Winternitz asserts that they are to be counted among the most valuable treasures of Indian literature and that we should be ever beholden to Dr Ganapati Sastriyar for discovering them to the world.

Various scholars assign different dates to these dramas. Perhaps their views could be briefly put down as under:

1) Bhide, Dikshitar, Haraprasad Sastri — about 6th cen B.C.

2) Pusalkar, Ganapati Sastri, Jahgirdar, Kulkarni — 4th cen.

3) Chaudhry, Dhruva and Jayaswal — 2nd cen B.C

4) Konow, Lindenau, Samp, Weller — 2nd cen. A.D

5) Banerji-Sastri, Bhandarkar, Jolly, Jacobi, Keith — 3rd cen. A.D

6) Lesny, Winternitz — 4th cen

7) K. G. Sankar — 5th cen

8) Barnett, Devadhar, Hirananda Sastri — 7th cen.

9) P. V. Kane — 9th cen

10) Ramavatara Sarma Pandeya — 10th cen

11) Rangacharya Raddi — 11th cen.

We agree with Jayaswal and Dhruva and assign Bhasa to the end of the 2nd century B.C., but on independent grounds. The Bālacharita seems to have been written with the express purpose of inspiring his patron Puṣyamitra to murder his master Bṛhadratha and seize the throne for himself. The Dhanurmaha got up by Kamsa answers exactly to the army-melee organised by Puṣyamitra at the end of which Bṛhadratha was quietly murdered. The adjective 'anugatārthanāmadheya' as applied to

ugrasena in the drama is practically without any significance at all, but some sense can be squeezed out of the same if we apply the same to the patron Puṣyamitra for whose benefit the drama must have been first staged. The almost bloodless revolution suggested in the drama had its salutary effect on the patron. On this supposition, Bhasa should have been a contemporary of Puṣyamitra and Patanjali. The latter in III. i. 2 refers to the Śobhanikas or dramatic troupes staging Kamsavadha. This should have been most probably the same as Bhasa's Balacharita itself. - ye tāvadete śobhanikā nāmaite prattyakṣam kamsam ghātayanti etc. Patanjali's testimony clearly proves that Bālacharita might have had another title Kamsavadha. (Śri M. Ramakṛṣṇa Kavi mentions how other dramas of this series had alternative titles: Gadāyuddha or Ūrubhanga, Karṇabhāra or Karṇa.

dāna or Kuṇḍalāharaṇa, Abhiṣeka or Rāmābhiṣeka, Pratimā or Pratimārāma or Pratimā daśaratha). The famous Commentator of the Amarakośa, Kṣīrasvāmin (of the 9th or 10th Cen. A.D.) while commenting on Kṣattriya varga (Amarakośa II), explaining Chakravarti or maṇḍaleśvara - p76, Poona oriental series No. 43 - quotes while referring to so many ancient kings - Śūdrakastvagnimitro vā hālassyāt Śālivāhanaḥ. It seems therefore probable that Śūdraka and Agnimitra were identical. This gives us a clue to understand - at least partly - the mysterious śloka in the prastāvanā of the Mṛcchakaṭika:

ऋग्वेदं सामवेदं गणितमथ कलां वैदिकीं ह्यास्तिकीं च
शास्त्रं चार्थप्रसाध्यं परगतिमिति च क्षुद्रकं चोपकृष्टम्।
राज्ञां वीक्ष्य पुत्रं, परमसमुदयेनाभ्यषेचत्र चेष्टा
लब्ध्वा चायुः शताब्दं दशदिनसहितं रुद्रसेनोऽग्निमित्रः॥

The name 'Jvalanamitra' is given to Bhāsa by Vākpati, the author of the Gauḍavaha. Śūdraka speaks of himself as entering into fire in this verse; perhaps he might have come out of the

same unsheathed first like Avimāraka in Bhāsa's Drama who jumped into the fire out of sheer despair, only to be embraced by his father the fire-god. Vaiśiki and Hastiśikṣā, the two arts in which Śūdraka speaks of himself as having specialised are also mastered by most of Bhasa's heroes and a Hastiśikṣā is actually referred to in Bhasa's Pratijñā. Śūdraka also refers to himself as 'dvijamukhyatamaḥ kaviḥ' exactly as the Brahmin Puṣyamitra.

We will try to show in the succeeding pages that the post-Asokan society depicted in these dramas agrees most admirably with this supposition that Bhasa should have been a protege of Puṣyamitra. Buddhism was slowly coming into disfavour with the general populace and dramatists like Bhasa must have done much spadework with their Pauranika dramas in popularising the tenets of Hinduism among the masses. Puṣyamitra's accession must have meant an acceleration to the Vedic religion of sacrifices

and inaugurated a Brahmanical revival.

The Rājasimha theory. Pandit Rāmāvatara Sarma Pāndeya contributed an article in 1915 to the Samskrit journal Sāradā doubting the validity of Dr Ganapati Sastriyar's ascription of these dramas to Bhasa and Dr Barnett in 1919 approvingly ascribed these dramas to an anonymous courtpoet of some Kerala king Rajasimha just because seven out of these thirteen dramas - evidently the majority - contain in their Bharatavākyas a blessing invoked upon the Rajasimha. Pandeya Sarma pitched upon Rajasimha III, the Chola King of the 10th century, while Barnett is inclined to identify this Rajasimha with Mahendravikrama Varma, the author of the Matta-vilāsaprahasana (Travancore Samskrit series No 55) of the 7th cen. Both these are gratuitous suppositions and based upon rather farfetched and ingenious theories. (Sri A. Govinda Warriar in an article in Journal of the Bombay Hist Society (1928, p164) refers to 3 Rājasimhas, Rāja Simha I 9th cen; Rāja Simha II 11th cen, and Rajasimha III of Mammārkōyil also 11th cen (1013 AD); he is inclined to put Bhasa under the first Rajasimha

Sri Shivali Sundaracharlar, Sahitee Vallabha, in his review of the drama as published in Kathiawar argued that the drama could not be ascribed to the famous Bhasa in the Hindu of and Dr. C. Kunhan Raja in the same Sunday (Edn. Sept) Edition the next week approved of the idea and declared he had even spoken to the author in Poona and that subsequently the author had since died.

b) The chronological order of the dramas.

The 13 dramas may be grouped under 3 heads thus:

Rāma dramas	Bhārata and early Kṛṣṇa legend	Bṛhatkathā or Folklore
Pratimā - 7 acts	Dūta Vākya	Avimāraka - 6 acts
Abhiṣeka - 6 acts	Dūtaghaṭotkacha	Pratijñāyaugandharāyaṇa - 4 acts
	Madhyama Vyāyoga } one-act dramas	Svapnavāsavadattā - 6 acts
	Karṇabhāra	Cārudatta 4 acts.
	Ūrubhanga	
	Pancharātra - 3 acts	
	Bālacharitā - 5 acts	

Madras

The inclusion of the recently published 'Pratimaphala' in the Bhāsa canon is not free from doubt and is left open: add

Earlier scholars have not attempted to chronologically arrange these dramas since the question of common authorship itself was and is even now hanging fire. Latterly Dr Pusalker and following him Justice A.S.P. Ayyar have addressed themselves to this question. Dr Pusalkar's order is Dūta Vākya, Karṇabhāra, Dūtaghaṭotkacha, Ūrubhanga, Madhyamavyāyoga, Pancharātra, Abhiṣeka, Bāla-charita, Avimāraka, Pratimā, Pratijñāyaugandharāyaṇa

Svapnavāsavadattā and Cārudatta. Of course, this learned scholar has taken into consideration the matter and manner of these plays their slowly evolving maturity and dialogues, but he seems to have been influenced to a great extent by the 'poetic licenses and weak endings' (p.119 - Bhāsa - a Study) and similar other rather mechanical considerations.

But Justice A.S.P. Ayyar in his monograph on Bhāsa in the Indian Men of Letters series, 1942, seems disposed to arrange the chronology thus: Dūta Vākya, Karnabhāra, Madhyamavyāyoga, Bālacharita, Abhiseka, Pancharātra, Dūtaghatotkacha, Urubhanga, Avimāraka, Pratimā, Pratijnā, Svapna and Cārudatta. Both of them start with Dūta Vākya and accept tacitly that the Cārudatta was left incomplete owing to his death. We cannot agree with this view; it might have as Dr Pusalkar seems tempted to believe, developed first into a drama of great (p.174 - Bhāsa - a Study) before developing into the Mrccha-Katika finally; but to argue that it was the last of his

dramas appears to be going farther than the evidence would warrant. Tradition makes the Svapnavāsavadattā the production of his mature genius as recorded by Rājaśekhara's 'literary fire-test'. The five one-act dramas are really 'gems of the purest ray serene' and they might be regarded in their chronological order as the best productions of the middle formative period. Hence, the following order would be more favourable from the point of view of gradual evolution. I would start with the Bālacharita for reasons already specified and not with Dūtavākya as both the learned scholars propose. Bālacharita, Abhiṣeka (to commemorate Viśvāmitra's accession), Madhyama, Dūtavākya, Dūtaghaṭotkacha, Pratimā, Karmabhāra, Tarubhanga, Pañcharātra, Chārudatta, Pratijñā, and Svapna. In this order, I believe, there is a progressive growth in dramatic technique, skill and originality; but this chronological order itself is a ticklish question bound to be indecisive and I leave the matter open after stating my own personal predilections. The humourist, the romancer, the poet and the politician seem to have been harmonised into a myriad-minded personality, exactly as in Tagore in our own time, for example.

स्वकाव्यसंहारविधौ स्वकानां दीप्तानि वह्नेरपि मानसानि ।
भासस्य काव्यं खलु विष्णुधर्मान् सोऽप्याननात्पारतवन्मुमोच॥

Add. This latter was thrown into fire in a literary dispute between Mumitbhasa and Vyasa and fire did not burn this Kavya. This विष्णुधर्म may be the विष्णुधर्मोत्तर referred to by Alberuni who might have wrongly attributed it to Vyasa instead of Bhasa.

A miniature prologue, starting with the 13th item of the पूर्वरंग (लोपी) if rightly performed, would hardly leave any room for the prologue of the dramatist. In spite of the superfluity, both were performed before the audience for nearly 700 years from Bharata's time. The 60 गीतक including वर्धमानक + तण्डव, उत्थापन + परिवर्तन with their accompanying music must have entertained the audience. This double पूर्वरंग, having items coming with कवि

Chapter II – His authorship of the 13 plays.
- Testimonies therein.

But now the question confronts us: are these the only dramas of Bhāsa? Tradition is unanimous in assigning more than 20 dramas and some poems also to him. Jonarāja (circa 15th cen. A.D) in his commentary on Pṛthvirājacharita of Jayānka (12th cen.) I. 3 Bhāsasya kāvyam khalu viṣṇudharmān sopyānanāṭakāratanmumocha) remarks इत्यादि भासस्य काव्यं विष्णुधर्मान् मुमोच, भासस्य नाटकानि मुमोच: the implies that a Kāvya named Viṣṇudharma was also composed by him. Similarly Ratnāvali, Udāttarāghava and other dramas are also attributed to this prolific dramatist. More than a dozen slokas are also attributed to him in the various anthologies and it may be quite possible that some of these slokas may be found in these lost dramas. Abhinavagupta's Nāṭyaśāstra Baroda Ed. VIII. p. 251 reads: [illegible] प्रसाधनं भवति, पूर्वरङ्गस्याङ्गभूतानयेन [illegible] पूर्वरङ्गस्य: कविभासादीनां छत्रमकं [illegible] निर्मितानि [illegible] कवि: [illegible]

This musical part of the पूर्वरङ्ग was criticised as being too heavy and tiresome and even Bharata advised dramatists to curtail the same. कार्यो नातिप्रसङ्गोऽत्र नृत्यगीतविधिं प्रति। गीतवाद्येन वृत्ते च प्रवृत्तेऽतिप्रसङ्गतः। खेदो भवेत्प्रयोक्तॄणां प्रेक्षकाणां तथैव च। खिन्नानां रसभावेषु स्पष्टता नोपजायते। अतः शोषप्रयोगेषु न रागजनको भवेत्॥ Bharata V. 165-167.

In the heyday of the पूर्वरङ्ग, it was performed in full by the सूत्रधार; after it was over, he retired & sent his assistant, called स्थापक to sing the dramatist's मन्दी. In some other cases, the सूत्रधार of the पूर्वरङ्ग overstayed to sing the dramatist's मन्दी also as perhaps in Bhāsa - Nāndi & पूर्वरङ्ग, by Prof. A.D. Athavale of Ahmedabad in Oriental Thought I. 1 Dec'54.

गानादीवच्चि पदम्। यद्वाहु श्रीहर्षः - अत एव हासो (भासो?) नाम कवि: कासौ चिन्नाटके (नलविक्रमे?) दिवं यातः चित्रं यदेष कविरित्थमिव अभिनन्दते। अहो नाम महान् प्रकृतो ऽवस्थापहृत इत्यादि। This passage is quoted at length, because Sri Harsa, a prior Commentator on Bhavata quotes a drama (Nala Vikrama?) evidently of Bhasa in which the usual Sthapana ending with अये! किं नु खलु मया विज्ञापनव्यग्रे etc is not to be met with at all. It seems, on Abhinava's testimony itself, to end in the way in which all Prastavanas of other Sanskrit dramas usually end. It might not have been a Sthapana as the 12 Trivandrum dramas all their introductory scene (Karnatha alone having a Prastavana). So one thing emerges from this discussion that wherever the Sthapana has the words - अये! किं नु खलु मया विज्ञापनव्यग्रे ... इति, one should not jump to the conclusion that it is a drama of Bhasa. This so-called Lakshana proposed for these dramas by Sri Ganapati Shastri is open to the defects of both avyapti and ativyapti

and led to such absurd conclusions as the Āścharya-
chūḍāmaṇi, Dāmaka prahasana, Subhadrā dhanañjaya,
Mattavilāsa prahasana are being ascribed to him. Another
similar defective lakṣaṇā proposed for these dramas
was the sūtradhāra Kṛtārambhatva for them. Bhāsa
himself was not responsible for such defective
lakṣaṇās and he himself carefully differentiated
the ordinary Sūtradhāra from the prastāvanāpra-
-saṁāpanasūtradhāra in the Dūtaghaṭotkacha Nāndi.

The quotation from Abhinava reminds us of
the absence in the Trivandrum Svapna - of the
quotations made by that learned critic for example,
from the 'Svapnavāsavadatta of Bhāsa'. While commen-
-ting on the Dhvanyāloka III.14 p. 152 N.S. Edition,
Anandavardhana in his Vṛtti says there are
poets whose only object is to employ Alaṁkāras
in their works even to the extent of neglecting
the sentiments or rasa. Abhinava Commentator
this remarks - यथा च महाकवेर्बाणस्य -

संचित पंचमकपाटं नयन द्वारं हरन्तडकेन।
उच्छ्वास स्य प्रविष्टा हृदयगृहं मे मृगनयनाः॥

In this context, it would be pertinent to remark that Hemachandra, the author of the Kāvyānuśāsana probably a direct student of Abhinava himself quotes the second line as उच्छ्वास्य प्रविष्टा हृदयगृहं मे मृगनयनाः
सा हृदय चौरी - p. 25 N.S. Edition 1934. Some others read the first word as nyanchita and not sanchita. From this, it is abundantly clear that most of the quotations from our Kavyas were made by our critics very often from memory. This must be a sufficient answer to those critics who argue that some of the quotations made as from a Chandalika are really to be found in the Mrechakatika. This apart, the explanation of Dr Thomas was that the Cakkiyars or Malayalee dramatic troupes were them. selves careful students of Abhinava and when they found that this defect was a serious one, they purposely

expunged this from their stage. Cupid. This explanation is quite plausible and the verse can easily be fitted up into the context in the dream scene (V act) soon after the king's sentence दयिते, किमाकर्णयसि ! चरणे रक्तम् शिरसि वज्रम्. As Dr Thomas pertinently remarks, the two previous anuṣṭubs are preceded by a short sentence and symmetry would require this short sentence to be preliminary to the śloka. K. G. Sankar and Dhruva have similarly suggested other places in the Drama where the śloka could also be fitted in.

~~In this context it would be pertinent to note~~

It is rather curious ~~to note~~ that this very Abhinava whose authority is cited against the acceptance of the Bhāsa hypo. thesis has himself quoted in his Nāṭyaśāstra certain sentences from these so called Trivandrum dramas without quoting the name of Kālidāsa. See on p. 362 of VI adhyāya, Abhinava quotes: सिद्धो

ब्रह्मविभारके (द्वितीयेऽङ्के) छात्री आह -

छात्री - अयय, किं चिन्ती अदि? (आर्य, किं चिन्तयसि?)

आदि - अक्खाणि, कामदं चिन्तयामि।

धात्री- किं नाम इदं रमाणस्य हस्थं चिन्तीअदि? (किं नामैतद् रमणीयं शास्त्रं चिन्त्यते?)

अवि - योगशास्त्रं चिन्त्यते।

धात्री - (सोच्छेदं)- पाडिग्गहीदं मङ्गलवअणं, जो अस्सत्थं एव होदु। (प्रतिगृहीतं मङ्गलवचनं, योगशास्त्रमेव भवतु)।

अवि - को नु वाक्यार्थः? अन्यदभिलाषवशादन्यथा संभावयामि

This passage is found, word for word in the Triv. Avimaraka. Again on p 360, we read

प्रसिद्धैः - प्रसाधकैः प्रकृष्टसाधकैः प्रसिद्धैः पूर्वमेव सिद्धैः एव

गदायुद्धे बलदेवः दुर्योधनमाह -

बलदेवः - भीमसेन इदानीं तव वचनानुन्यायं स्थास्यामि।

दुर्योधनः - किं नाहं भीमसेनेन वञ्चितः?

बल - अलं केवलं भवानवंचेव हत।

दुर्योधनः - श्रूयताम् -

येनेयं रमणीयं पारिजातकतरुमञ्जरी तुल्या हृता

दिव्ये वर्षसहस्रमेव चलतो युद्धप्रथा दोर्बलात्।

तीव्रां भीमगदां प्रविश्य सहसा निर्भीज युद्धप्रियः

तेनाहं जगतां प्रियेण हरिणा मूर्ध्नो प्रतिग्राहितः।

अत्र वाक्यार्थस्य साधका एव भगवतो विष्णोः पारिजातहरण-क्रीडावटुपक्षपातादयः etc. This last prose sentence is

Abhinava's own comment. The previous quotation from a 'Gadāyuddha' is found, almost word for word, in the Trivandrum Urubhanga with only two slight verbal alterations; the third line begins with 'Tīvrām' instead of 'dīptyā' and in the last line jagatah priyena is found in the place of the plural jagatām. One may easily suggest that another manuscript of the said drama might be procured in which these readings may be found. Could it be possible that in Abhinava's time, the drama was known by an alternative title 'Gadāyuddha' which title was popularly adopted as for example in Kannada by the classic Jaina RANNA (10th cen A.D). It is interesting to note that this Kannada poet has borrowed, without properly acknowledging the source, many of Bhasa's ideas (as also Bhaṭṭa Nārāyaṇa's). One such example is the curious sloka in Ās'vāsa (=chapter) VI. 28 (Rāmānuja Iyengar's Edition of 1925)

guru lakṣyasiddhiyillene parivambam paridu pididu
begam tarpam.

tire pavana javade pavanaja paridam mandirade yalli
- yidirumbaleyam.

This sloka refers to a peculiar story according to which

the Kaurava teacher of Dhanurveda, while teaching both the Kauravas and the Pandavas in his 'iṣvastraśālā' or College of Archery, once held a small test; therein he disapproved of Bhima's archery as if saying 'you have no lakṣyasiddhi or skill in hitting the target'; touched to the quick, Bhima at once walked up to the target, reaching there 'pavana javadi' or with the speed of the wind, as he was himself the wind god's son, even before the arrow could reach the target and took back the arrow he had already discharged. Well, the Ādi Parva of the Bhārata epic as we have it at present, does not refer to such a test in which Bhima figures. It refers to another 'astrapariksā' in which the princes were asked to shoot at a 'bhāsa pakṣi' ~~and Arjuna~~ among the princes declared that he could see the head of the bird proposed as his target and no other thing in between. Drona chose him therefore to shoot and he did. But this incident referred to by RANNA was evidently borrowed by him from Bhasa's Pancharātra III.12 where we read - द्रुवस्त्रशालायां

द्वि - कर्णायते तेन शरे विमुक्ते विकाशितं तस्य शिरो मयोक्तम्।
गत्वा तदा तेन च बाणतुल्यम प्राप्तलक्षः स शरो गृहीतः॥

As far as I could see, this episode has not been

referred to in any other Sanskrit drama or poem. Rama's sympathetic characterisation of Duryodhana is another definite echo of Bhasa's Urubhanga hero. Aśvatthāma confronting Duryodhana's departing Śrī and chiding her in the beginning of the next Aśvāsa in Rama's work exactly reproduces Kamsa's remonstration of his own departing Śrī in the second act of the Bālacharita.

Similarly it has already been shown in the Indian Historical Quarterly vol V p. 724 even in 1929 that a Śākuntala Vyākhyā preserved in the Oriental Manuscripts Library, Madras (R No. 2778) mentions the Trivandrum Chārudatta, Dūtaghaṭotkacha, Pancharātra, Bālacharita, Svapnavāsavadatta, and Avimāraka, the quotations fully agreeing with them. The manuscript has been assigned to the 14th cen. A.D and proves that Dr Ganapati Sastri could not have forged these dramas from his fertile brain. Similarly the Kundamāla statement - रुद्रस्य प्रतिमागतो महाराजः towards the end of Act I has already shown to refer to Bhasa's Pratimā, no other Rama's story known to be extant referring to the pratimās of the dead.

Chapter III - Jvalanamitra tradition examined.

Vākpati, the author of the Gaudavaho and a contemporary of Bhavabhūti, remarks in verse 800 which when translated from Prākrit reads thus:

bhāse jvalanamitre Kāntideva cha tathā raghukāre
Saubandhave cha bandhe Harichandre cha ānandaḥ

The title 'jvalanamitra' or friend of fire applied to Bhasa is intriguing. This tradition might refer to the fire-test which Bhasa's dramas had to submit to before being adjudged excellent (compare Rājaśekhara's 'svapnavāsavadattasya dāhakobhūtna pāvakaḥ). Even Dr Winternitz has been forced to admit that this is merely a synonym of Agnimitra. Śūdraka and Agnimitra are identical according to a Nāmamālā quoted by Kṣīrasvāmin in his Commentary on the Amarakośa II.8 - Śūdrakastvagnimitro vā hālasyāccchālivāhanaḥ. The śloka ending with agnim praviṣṭaḥ in the Prastāvanā of the Mṛcchakaṭika seems to suggest that Śūdraka entered fire and evidently became a 'friend of Agni' or Agnimitra (as it did not burn him). If we interpret this tradition thus,

the mist surrounding the Cārudatta could be partially cleared up. Bhasa might have lived in the reign of the father Puṣyamitra and wrote the drama Cārudatta and the other 12 dramas and perhaps also some more. After some time, both Puṣyamitra and Bhasa died, and the son Agnimitra alias Śūdraka added a political episode to the already existing small love-comedy in 4 acts and enlarged it into the Mṛcchakaṭika. The interval between the smaller and larger versions might have been so very short, perhaps only about 10 or 15 years and the busy monarch Agnimitra, eager to have his own name preserved to posterity as the sole and real author of the Mṛcchakaṭika, tried (with his royal prerogatives perhaps) to suppress the older Cārudatta, making all his contemporaries understand that he was the sole author. But somehow, the fact of the suppression of the Cārudatta possibly hinted on in some remote corners and Kṣīrasvāmi in about the 10th cen, remembered the tradition and recorded it. But the general scholar was misled by this literary plagiarism and some of the literary critics like Vāmana (who

seem to have had access to both) quoted indiscriminately from both and often attributed sentences from the one to the other. The title 'Jvalanamitra' or Agnimitra as applied to Bhasa in the beginning might be due to the fact that one of Bhāsa's heroes, Avimāraka, jumped into the fire in IV.8 out of sheer despondency, but the fire-god only embraced him - putram pitevā parisvajati prahrstah. Late Agnimitra might purposely have adopted that very name so that his plagiarism might go undetected. Many of the dramas in this group like Cārudatta and the two Udayana dramas have elephant episodes. The Pratijnā pertinently refers to a Hastisiksā in which a 'nilakuvalayatamah divyavāranah Chakravarti hasti' was referred to. From the Cārudatta, we can guess that Bhasa had an intimate knowledge of Vāsiki or the skilful wiles practised by the harlots. Only the knowledge of the science of gaṇita or Mathematics is not prominently featured in the dramas of this group. The thorough mastery of the Rg Veda and Sāmaveda was quite natural for a Brahmin as Śūdraka tells us in the previous verse of the same Prastāvanā that he was a 'dvijamukhyatamah kavih' History tells us that the Śungas were Brahmins and the

Hari Vamśa Bhaviṣya Parva II. 40 refers to - senānīḥ kāśyapo dvijaḥ - the Senāni Puṣyamitra as a dvija of the Kāśyapa gotra. The other points of the performance of the Aśva-medha and seeing his son a King - rājānam vīkṣya putram paramasamudayenāśvamedhena cheṣṭvā - agree fully with Puṣyamitra seeing Agnimitra who had assumed royalty in Vidiśā according to the testimony of Kalidasa's Mālavikāgnimitra V or contemporary history. Samudragupta also might have performed the same yāga, but he did not see his son Chandragupta a King.

Chapter IV – Some criticisms Considered.

Prof. Pisharodi asserts that these 13 dramas exhibit very many Malayali features and since the Chakyar (Corrupted from Sanskrit Ślāghyar or praiseworthy) dramatic repertoire consists of most of these dramas besides the Nāgānanda, Āscharyachūḍāmaṇi, Bhagavadajjukiyam etc and also since these are very popular on the Malabar stage, there must be late productions introduced into Malabar after the reformation of the stage by Kulaśekhara Varma Perumal and Bhāskara Ravi Verma Perumal in the 11th cen. A.D. There is a tradition among them that the first among these (Kulaśekhara Varma) was the author of the Tapati-Saṃvaraṇa and Subhadrādhanañjaya and that he also regularised the Malabar stage by his āṭṭaprākāram. The latter is also popularly believed to have composed the Vicchinnābhiṣeka or the Tract of the Pratimā. The Trivandrum dramas, being anonymous, there is room for the belief that they are stage copies, prepared by the Chakyars, Prof Pisharodi suggests.

We may concede at once that Bhasa might have been himself a Malayali, or what is more probable, a Tamilian of the Chera country as suggested by the late Prof Vasudeva Sarma in the Hindu Literary Supplement

dated 9. 2. 1927. Bhasa might therefore exhibit some peculiar South Indian mannerisms, but these by themselves cannot posit a late date. If the Chākkyar repertoire consists of the stage copies of the Āścharyachūdāmaṇi, Nāgānanda, Bhagavad-ajjukiya and these dramas, are we entitled to jump to the conclusion that the Chākkyars were themselves the authors of all of them? Nobody would be prepared to assign the Nāgānanda at any rate to them just because it may be very popular on the Malabar stage and some other reason must be adduced for the anonymity of the Trivandrum plays. As regards some peculiar Malayali words like Sambandha, neubbāmana etc noted by Dr Kunhan Raja, one Malayali scholar, other Malayali scholars, equally versatile like Sri Harihara Sastri, Raman Nambiyar, Ullur S. Parameshwara Iyyar etc have explained that they need not be regarded as such alone and could easily be explained otherwise also. One of such 'offending' words is the word 'Sambandha' used in Pratijnā IV - evam sambandham manyate mahāsenah. Anybody who reads the context can satisfy himself that Bhasa never meant to suggest that Udayana would regard Vāsavadattā as his 'Sambandha' wife in the peculiar Malayali-sense of the term. Udayana's conception is too holy for such a low type of companionship which cannot

be regarded as marriage in the Dharmaśāstra sense. The burden of the two Udayana stories is the triumph of steadfast, unfaltering, undying love for which no sacrifice is deemed too great either by Vāsavadattā or Udayana. As Bhāsa himself remarks, this love is far superior to the love of the 'Chakravāka' couples or any other chaste couple reputed in the Purāṇas so far - नैवेदानीं तादृशाः चक्रवाकाः नैवान्यत्र स्त्रीविशेषैर्विमुक्ताः Svapna I.13. Even otherwise, the word Sambandha is a very orthodox word adored even by Vālmīki in the Sundarakāṇḍa - अस्माकमपि सम्बन्धः पार्थिवमुख्य तपस्विनि वै, by Kālidāsa - सम्बन्धमाभाषणपूर्वमाहुः Raghu II, विक्रियायै न कल्पन्ते सम्बन्धाः सदनुग्रहाः (Kumāra VI. 29), and by Bhavabhūti जनकानां रघूणां च सम्बन्धः कस्य न प्रियः Uttara I. To regard Mahāsena's queen as a senior 'Malayali lady' is to read our own ideas into the drama. Much is made of the fact that Sita does not sit with Rāma at the ceremony of the coronation in the I act or the last act. This, it is alleged, is even now the case with Travancore or Cochin Maharajas and Bhāsa is alleged to have but followed this tradition. But the late Prof. S.V. Venkateswara in his Indian Culture Through the Ages Vol II p 242 pertinently remarks 'If in the later epic period, Sita (Bāla Kāṇḍa XIV. 38 and Yuddha Kāṇḍa XXVIII 59) and Draupadi (Śānti Parva XXXVII 44

were present at the coronation of their husbands, it was evidently not obligatory or essential and the ceremonial rites and the mantras in the context did not at all demand her presence. In the Raghuvamsa, Kalidasa does not make Sita sit by the side of Rama in XIV Canto, nor does he make Kausalya sit by his side in the XVII Canto. Even otherwise, a careful perusal of the context will convince any reader that Sita's presence in such a hurriedly got-up ceremony was also entirely impossible. Bharata's story is completely different from the Ramayana where His Coronation was decided upon by Dasaratha in consultation with Vasistha and ratified by the Constituent Assembly of popular representatives at least 15 days before the actual ceremony. In the context in the epic, Dasaratha can be easily charged with a guilty conscience inasmuch as he is consciously trying to hurry through the coronation before the absent Bharata returns from his grandfather's country - [illegible] to quote his instructions to Sumantra in the context. Why this unseemly haste and why are the two nearest relations - the brother of the Queen Kaikeyi and the father-in-law of the proposed Yuvaraja - to be omitted from the list of the invitees? The answer

at once suggests itself that the Kekaya King might demand the throne for his nephew because of the rājyaśulka which Daśaratha had agreed to at the time of his marriage with her. (As he was very old at the time, to persuade her to consent, he had promised the kingdom to her son, if he might have children exactly as in Śāntanu's case in the other epic). Bharata himself might not have known this; but Rāma assures him that the kingdom is really his and satisfies him with that last plea when he comes to Pañcavaṭī—

purā bhrātaḥ pitā naḥ sma mātaraṃ te samudvahan
mātāmahe samādraṃsīd rājyaśulkamanuttamam.

If Janaka is also excluded from the ceremony, the reason is not clear from the epic or even Bhāsa; the same is suggested by another authority (Padma Purāṇa) that he was one of the witnesses to Daśaratha's marriage with Kaikeyī and as would have demanded its execution even if it meant loss of the kingdom for his son-in-law. Anyway, the explanation provided in the epic, paścāt tau śrosyataḥ priyam, that they would hear later and rejoice, is obviously a lame one. If they are excluded on the plea that they were too far and could not easily

come up for the muhurtam of the Coronation, this is not convincing since another more convenient day a few days later could easily have been pitched upon as they were the nearest and the dearest relations. So one can easily see through Dasaratha's eager anxiety to hurry up the coronation before Bharata's arrival. In the epic, again, no satisfactory reason is afforded for Kaikeyī or her priti-dāsī Mantharā or yet her own brother, both of whom tacitly took Rama's coronation a fait accompli; this is particularly inexplicable when all of them must have been active participants, or even must have dictated the marriage contract. Why Kaikeyī should have forgotten this plea on which any court could easily grant a decree in her favour (courts in those days were empowered to try such cases and also nyāya litigations in both of which the decisions were not at all contested) and should have begged for the kingdom almost by beggar methods, when the straightforward method was open to her, is an inexplicable riddle indeed.

In this connection, it is interesting to note that all the extant versions of the epic & the stories based thereon, like the Hindi Rāmacharita mānasa or the Tamil Kambar, or the Kannada Torave or even the Telugu Bhadrāchalam versions mention Kaikeyī as begging the kingdom as a boon and Bharata alone is unique in making her demand her rājyashulka, as in the epic. She does not do so out of rājyadharma but with a sincere desire to make the king keep his plighted word. All inconsistencies are removed in Bhāsa's version which may be summarised thus: Bharata has gone with Śatrughna to his uncle's kingdom for a holiday; meanwhile, one fine morning, Daśaratha suddenly takes ill and within a few minutes, the illness takes a very serious turn and Rama is naturally summoned to the bedside. The dying king requests Rama to accept the kingdom; Rama refuses but the old king persists to such an extent that Rama is reluctantly forced to agree. It is only then that Vasishṭha is sent for and word is also sent to the Nepathyapatiṇī, Ārya Revā, the stage manager of the royal palace to stage a drama in honour of the occasion (as the

can do within half an hour's time). But when Vasistha had just started the ceremonies, Kaikeyi demands her rājya śulka through Manthara and the entire proceedings are abruptly cancelled. This has happened within about an hour of Dasaratha's suddenly taking ill, and soon the trio, Rama, Sita and Lakshmana are already started for the forest. News is brought to them that Dasaratha is almost dying but fearing that the old King's plighted word to Kaikeyi might be retracted through indecision if he saw them, the trio want to send a farewell message, but under the stress of emotion, they silently depart with tears — anuktvaiva vanam gatah - they went away without sending any message. Soon after, Sumantra returns and informs the King that his children have departed; Dasaratha soon collapses, perhaps within 2 hours of his first taking ill; Could there be any possibility of Sita being summoned to be by Rama's side when the events were being hurried through thus? In the epic, on the other hand, nearly 10 or 15 days must have elapsed after the first decision of Dasa

ratha was ratified by the Constituent Assembly, and even after this, Dasaratha's death actually takes place in Ayodhyā full five days after Rāma's departure. From Bhāsa's standpoint, Kaikeyī does not come up on the stage before III act. She only sends a message about rājya śulka through Manthara and is not at all present at Dasaratha's bedside. The Counterpart in the epic might demand that the Rās should go to the forest clad in bark garments and might receive dire abuse from Sumantra and Vasistha therefor; but here the bark garments come in quite by accident. How with this reshuffling of the entire situation, no blame can be attributed to anybody, everybody can easily realise. With reference to Sita's not being by Rama's side even in the last act, one may perhaps argue that in his desire to end the drama soon, Bhasa suggests that the regular Coronation would follow in Ayodhyā; now he wanted only a formal coronation, at Kaikeyī's express desire, in the 'nirjana vanavāsa' where alone a real coronation can be consecrated. The other coronation celebrated

in a city had proved abortive. Even the three abhisekas in the Abhisēka drama are consecrated outside the city limits and only hence perhaps, they do not end miserably as the one celebrated inside the royal palace of Ayodhyā. So Sītā's absence at the coronation can be easily explained otherwise than as a kuladharma custom, and even if it is regarded as one, there is not much harm from our standpoint.

The other objections can easily be faced now. The Pratimā and the Svapna are far superior in quality as compared with the rather poor stuff in the Pañcharātra and the Avimāraka, it is alleged. Well, it is quite natural that the earlier compositions of an author should never claim the mature perfection of the later ones and this is definitely the case with an author whose literary output is large in the case of Shakespeare or Tennyson for example in English. Bhasa might have lived a full life like Tennyson, gaining more and more learned

experience with the lapse of time and Avimāraka exhibits its poor stuff by freely indulging upon the supernatural element at every stage. To the credit of Bhasa, it must be observed, that he realised this defect of the earlier dramas the Balacharita and the Avimāraka and carefully avoided them in his later dramas. As regards the other criticism, that the Avimaraka is based upon the Mālatimādhava, the answer is obvious that the simple story of the Avimāraka with its inartistic clinging to the supernatural at every step has supplied the basis for Bhavabhuti's skilfully woven plot. Similarly, Bhavabhuti's use for the pathos in the Uttararāmacharita was definitely derived from Bhasa's Urubhanga and Pratimā. Bhāsa's Pratimā

वयमयशसा, वीरेणार्यो, नृपो गृहमृत्युना
प्रततकपिटैः कृत्स्नायोध्या, मृगैः सह कृष्णया।
दयिततनयाः शोकेनाम्बाः, स्नुषा च परिश्रमैः
स्थगितिति वयस्यो-योगेनात्मा, त्वयानु योजितः III.17.

inspired Bhavabhuti's verse in the Mahāvīracharita IV 52, where Kaikeyī's brother rates her roundly for her wickedness: पतिमृत्योः वक्त्रं, व्रजति वना नेत स्नुषयुगं

वधूहीरक्षोभ्यो बलिरिव वराको प्रणिहितः
निराकम्पो लोकः, कुलमयशसा नञ्च निहितम्।
स्वसुर्मे दौरात्म्यं जगदविकलं विकलयति॥

Bhavabhuti's feeble attempt to imitate the skilfully arranged Svapna scene by making Sita dream of Rama's chest in the first act of the Uttara Ramacharita can easily tell its own tale as to who the borrower should be. Another objection is raised that the Pratimā genealogy of the Raghu race is borrowed from the Raghuvamsa; but this objection cannot stand since according to Kalidasa's epic, the viraji sacrifice is performed by Raghu, and not by Dilipa as Bhasa would make us believe. Bhasa has not a single word about Raghu's digvijaya which inspires Kalidasa's best poetry even to the extent of naming his Kavya after that extraordinary hero. Bhasa again speaks of Aja as having attained mental peace by daily sacrificial baths after his wife Indumati's death, while Kalidasa simply tells us that he somehow bided his time in sorrow and retirement till Dasaratha came to be sufficiently aged to be "varmahara" or to carry his armour. Under the circumstances, it is more probable that Bhasa borrowed

the genealogy from the Puranic lists such as those in the Harivamsa or the Vishnu Purana or the Vayu Purana. The mention of Medhātithi, again, in the Pratimā, has come in for very strong criticism. This Medhatithi to whom Ravana refers as the author of a Nyāyasastra which he has mastered is dogmatically asserted to be the same as the 10th century commentator of Manu. But when Manu is separately mentioned by Ravana, whose very purpose is to boast about his mastery over many sāstras, one could not think that he would be referring to but another aspect of the same sāstra. Rather, he must be regarded as being at pains to explain his mastery over many more sāstras, and the fact is that Medhātithi is another name of Gautama, the author of the Nyāyasūtras as the testimony of Bhārata epic Sānti Parva 265th chapter 45th verse records: Medhātithirmahāprājnah gautamastapasi sthitah. One can easily meet the other objection of Prof. Pusharvadi that the Pratimānāṭaka idea was borrowed by the "anonymous poet" — that is how he refers to Bhāsa — from the statue of a 'Shera' king in a Siva temple at Tiruvanchikulam. Dr Ganapati Sastriar

distinguishes the pratimās of Bhāra where we see a gallery of royal statues from the statue of King, Bhaskara Ravivarman in the temple. Worship of departed Kings is found in some other parts of India, in Rajputana and Kathiawar, where warlike heroes martyred on the battlefield are worshipped in special temples installed by their devoted and loyal subjects. Jayaswal refers to the discovery of similar statues of dead Śaisunāga kings discovered near Mathurā (J.B.O.R.S 1919, Parkham Statue). So this custom should have started as heroworship. There is also the other theory that this idea was brought from the Egyptian Pyramids or their embalmed mummies by the merchants first into the west coast in the early centuries prior to the Christian Era.

Perhaps we could conclude with Prof Paranjpe. The desecrating vandalism of the literary thieves of Kerala may certainly be able to mangle and mutilate old plays, but they can never build up a new superstructure of the delicacy of a Svapnavāsavadattā or the grandeur of a Pratimā' and we might add, the skill of a Pancharātra.

Chapter X - Bhāsa and his early affiliations.

Bhasa seems to have been associated with Vālmiki, Vedavyāsa, Kautilya, Vātsyāyana, Bharata and other writers of the pre-Christian era. His style smacks of a very early idiom and bespeaks a living phase of the language. Here are a few examples.

The use of 'eva', 'vā' and 'kila' is peculiar and is definitely in a different strain from the usage of later writers like Bhāravi or Māgha. The following are a few culled at random:

1) [illegible] Pancharātra I.37 - p 383 Devadāsa.

2) [illegible] - Abhisheka III. p. 345.

3) [illegible] Svapna IV. 2. p. 24.

4) [illegible] - Pancha I. 31. p 87.

5) [illegible] - Urubhanga I. 31 p 497

6) [illegible] Pratimā V. p. 257.

These definitely indicate that these two conjunctions 'eva' and 'vā' had some definite living significance as is clear from them. Particularly the first from the Pancharātra is the context where Drona appeals, kill all the

sincerity and earnestness he can command, to Duryodhana's generosity, telling him that the Pandavas are weak, miserable, unfriended and seek their welfare from him alone. The 4th after each word joined adds to the earnestness of the appeal. The 4th instance again from the same context is also similar in its earnest appeal and reminds us of Kalidasa's tram sarvatogāmi cha sādhakam cha - Kumāra III. 12. Grammatically, if two 'cha's are used in the two metrical feet in the same sentence, one has to understand that the actions in the two clauses take place simultaneously as in Raghuvamsa X. 6 where the gods reach the milky ocean and exactly at the moment, Visnu gets up from his slumber - te cha prapurudaravantam. But the chādipūruṣaḥ later writers might use the 'cha' similarly but the living significance clearly associated therewith has definitely vanished as is clear from the following instances

1) [illegible] - Bhartrhari I. 3.

2) [illegible] - Hitopadesa

One could also see that the use of 'kila' in Bhasa is not in the sense of simple [illegible] - [illegible] i.e. so they say or indeed. 'Kila' adds emphasis and

sometimes also suggests a plaintive appeal as in Tamil

1) राज्यस्यार्धं प्रयच्छामि किम् - Pareka I. p. 383.

2) वर्षाणि किल चतुर्दश वने वसतो - Pratimā I. 23. p. 261

3) तेन सह अनेकारकः अटवीं प्रविशन्ति किल - Pratimā VI. p. 307.

The second case particularly makes Lakṣmaṇa utterly, he says: in the Pratimā he is not concerned about the loss of the kingdom at all, but he is certainly perturbed about his elder brother's having to live for 14 long long years in the forest! Similarly in the Dūtavākya after Vālin remarks chafingly अनुगतवतः किल चित्रपटः p. 40)

One can also see that Bhāsa is fond of using the past passive participle in the sense of an abstract noun, a regular feature of very old Prākrit and perhaps inherited from an earlier and a living phase of the Sanskrit language.

रामस्य राज्यात् भ्रष्टं कृतं तत्तेन - Pratimā III. p. 273 where vibhraṣṭa = vibhramśa a loss; similarly रामस्य राज्याभिषेकं कृतवती. p 283

The peculiar infinitive which has a passive sense unusually imbedded therein seems to be another old relic preserved in Bhāsa. To give some examples,

1) अभिषेचनाय आभरणानि मे मिश्रयन्ति भाण्डागारिकाः - Pratimā III. p. 280

उपोपविश्य पाण्डवः पर्यपृच्छदिदं वचः -

Drona Parva - प्रतिज्ञापर्व - 74.23 (Kumbak)

where upadeṣṭum must clearly be explained as upadiśya
mānam ātmānam icchāmi, that Bharata wants to remain
the instruction. Similarly युद्धकाण्ड XVIII.2 - श्रोतुमिच्छामि तत्सर्वं भवद्भिः = श्रूयमाणं
2) मम हस्ते निक्षिप्तं तव राज्यं चतुर्दशवर्षानि प्रतिग्रहीतुमिच्छामि
Pratimā IV. p 291, where pratigrahītum is to be interpreted,
not as to accept, but to be accepted. This is definitely against
Pāṇini's III. 3. 23. Kālidāsa also has only one instance
of such usage in Śākuntala II. Dushyanta request the sages -
he makes his here. Duryodhana request the sages -
ājñāpayitum icchāmi, evidently to be ordered, and not
at all to order. (The Trivandrum Edition of Kumāra III. 3.
reads 'icchāmi samvardhitum ājñaya' and not
samvardhitum ājñaya) cf the periphrastic Future in Dhātu in passive
sense imbedded in Aśvaghoṣa Buddhacharita I. 61. तं ऽधो कथयितुमिच्छामि: मे.
The double preposition उपेत्य in उपेत्य वसिष्ठ प्रवेशयति
भगवानपि सनत्कुमारः on p 275 in Pratimā III is archaic
and is allowed in the Vedas to complete a metrical line
- छन्दसि परे: पादपूरणे - Pāṇini VIII. 1. 6 In the छान्दोग्योपनिषत्
VI खण्ड, we find Satyakāma Jābāla asked by his teacher
to sit in front of the fire, परिस्तीर्णे: प्राक् उपोपविशेति. In the
Sundarakāṇḍa, Rāvaṇa when seen by Hanumān was
उपोपविष्टं रक्षोभिः चतुर्भिर्बलदर्पितैः. 49th Canto, 12th Verse.
This and similar other archaisms, already noted by
various scholars, are sufficient to make me convince that

Bhasa might have lived at a time when the grip of grammar over the language had not tightened itself as a result of Patanjali's mighty influence in literary circles. The truth of the matter might have been that Patanjali and Bhasa were themselves contemporaries. Grammatical studies slowly gained in importance only long after Patanjali and by the time of the Vākyapadīya (7th cen A.D) or Anandavardhana's Vārttika (850 A.D) came to be regarded as the most important śāstra. Cf Anandavardhana's testimony in Dhvanyāloka- [illegible] p 47 - N.S. Edition of 1911. If as the Pischarodis believe, Bhāsa should be assigned to the 7th cen A.D, Ravana's omission of Vyākaraṇa Sūtra among the Śāstras he has mastered would be a very serious defect.

The simplicity of the language, the brevity and the directness of the conversations which tend to focus a flood of light on every aspect of the character participating therein is another pointer to the antiquity and affinity with the earliest writers who, according to Keith, were free from all taint of artificiality and conventionalism. The Āryā metre, a favourite with Kālidāsa and later poets, occurs but twice in the Svapna and 11 times in

all the 13; the Svapna drama, in its 7 acts, has only 57 slokas while later poets after the 7th century A.D. like Bhatta Nārāyaṇa, Bhavabhūti, Rājaśekhara & Murāri bring in slokas in season and out of season. Some of the acts like the second in the Cārudatta have no slokas at all.

Sri N. Ghosh has shown in his article on the date of Bharata's Nāṭyaśāstra (Calcutta Department of Letters Vol XXV page 33) that Bhāsa has used two more metres than those dealt with by Bharata. Let me copy out his table of the extra metres:

रामायण	7
महाभारत	4
अश्वघोष	7
Author of Triv. plays (Bhāsa)	2
	5
कालिदास	10
भारवि	8
भट्टि	22
माघ	

Leaving the epics which are ārṣa or above all modern rules, I am tempted to rearrange the chronology thus.

Author of Triv Plays (भास)	2 (upajāti and aupacchandasika)
कालिदास	5
अश्वघोष	7

भट्टि – 8
भारवि – 10
माघ – 22. Comment is needless.

The artificiality of the anuprāsas and yamakas in later parts is notorious; but Bhāsa's alliterations are all straightforward exactly like those of Vālmīki. Even Kālidāsa and Aśvaghoṣa brought in yamakas with a conscious effort. The yamakas in IX canto of the Raghuvaṃśa, रुरोधिरे रुधिरेण परिक्षुतः, प्रमथनाथवतां च पुरीं हिरः etc speak for their artificiality; similar is the peculiar śloka रथाङ्गनामानि विभुर्बभार रथाङ्गपाणिर्विरथाङ्गपाणिः। विकर्मणीयः अयं नो पुरुषस्तु रथी मनोरथज्ञो नैर्ऋतः॥ IX.18 This last can easily be compared with Bhāsa's Pratimā II.11.

द्रुतः प्रातो यदि रथो भाद्रो मम मनोरथः
नूनं रथाङ्गपाणेर्मे कालेन प्रेषितो ज्वरः॥

and one can satisfy oneself that there is nothing of artificiality in Bhāsa's alliteration. In this connection, the artificiality in Aśvaghoṣa's alliterations deserves to be noted in the following śloka from Buddhacharita:

दुःखादिदोषो विषयावृतेभ्यः संसारकान्तारपथादितेभ्यः।
आख्यात्यसौ चैव विमोक्षमार्गं मार्गप्रणेतेव इवाध्वगेभ्यः॥ I.52

where the dative plural is purposely used to facilitate the

the alliteration. The more artificial alliteration in the same Kavya XII.93- अपारपारसंसारपारं प्रेप्सुरपारयत् can speak for itself. The theory has been advanced that Bhasa has borrowed some ideas from Asvaghosa e.g. Pratijnā I.18

काष्ठादग्निर्जायते मथ्यमानात्, भूमिस्तोयं खन्यमाना ददाति।
सोत्साहानां नास्त्यसाध्यं नराणां मार्गारब्धाः सर्वयत्नाः फलन्ति॥

this may echoes Buddhacharita XIII.60

काष्ठं हि मथ्यत लभते हुताशं, भूमिं खनान्विन्दति वापि तोयम्।
निर्बन्धिनः किंचन नास्त्यसाध्यं, व्यायेन युक्तं न कृतं न सर्वम्॥

but the truth seems to be the other way round. One could also think of the comparison in Nanda's holding the mirror in the Saundarananda IV.13

दत्त्वाथ स दर्पणमस्य हस्ते समाग्रतो धारय तावदेनम्।
विशोधकं यावदहं करोमीत्युवाच कान्तं स च तं बभार॥

with Rama's holding the mirror for Sita's decorating herself just before verse 9 in Act I, तेन हि अलंक्रियताम्। आदर्शं धारयिष्ये. A few of Bhasa's alliterations which are absolutely free from any tinge of artificiality may be noted at random:

1) तनयशतनय शून्ये दुर्योधनावशेषे - ऊरुभङ्ग प्रस्तावना।

2) पादः पायदुपेन्द्रस्य लोकनेत्रोत्सवः स वः
व्याक्षिप्तो नमुचिर्येन तनुताम्रनखेन खे॥ - दूतवाक्य नाटकी.

3) गतिमतिरहितेषु पाण्डवेषु क्षितिरखिलापि - Dutavakya I.6

4) अण्डवातलण्डित इव वरण्डः — अभिरुचक प्रस्तावना.

5) कोकिलानामक्षिपरिवर्त इव कुक्षिपरिवर्तः — Svapna IV. 1st para.

6) आरुह्यागेन्द्रं सद्विपेन्द्रं सगेन्द्रं — Abhisheka II. imitated by Bhoja in Sundarakanda of रामायणचम्पू.

7) दशोष्ठो मुष्टिमुद्यम्य निष्पेषेण घटोत्कचः।
उत्क्षिप्तेन पुमान्कश्चिन्नुमि रुद्धामलक्षयम्॥ — घटोत्कच I. 51.

This last sloka can be cited as a better example of 'ojas' from Anandavardhana's own standpoint than the instance he cites from the Veṇisaṃhāra यो यः शस्त्रं बिभर्ति स्व भुजगुरुमदः or चञ्चद्भुजभ्रमित- on pages 81 and 80 of his Dhvanyāloka. These instances are sufficient to show that Bhasa has used his figures of speech — not the yamakas alone — with proper discernment as he is steeped in Rasa. As Anandavardhana remarks on pp 86-87 in his दिव्यालोक — यमके च स्वभावेन बुद्धिपूर्वकक्रियायाः नियमेन यत्नान्तरपरिग्रहे आपतति शब्दविशेषान्वेषणरूपः अलङ्कारान्तरेष्वपि तत्तुल्यमिति चेत्, नैवम्। अलङ्कारान्तराणि हि निरायासमायुर्घटितानामपि रसतात्पर्याहितचेतसः प्रतिभावतः कवेः अहंपूर्विकया परापतन्ति etc. Prakāśavarṣa in his Rasārṇava remarks — कविषु सत्सु निकर्षं यमकं

चरु पुरोडाश

with ऋषि ऋ; that these yamakas are the touchstone of the poet's Vyutpatti or all-round culture and judging by this test, the yamakas may be adjudged ancient and not artificial.

Some words are used in very ancient and rare senses (even obsolete now) by Bhasa. We will note only a few. The Dhātupāṭha of Pāṇini mentions two senses for the root अद् - भक्षणे च गतौ: i.e. to go and also to eat. This latter sense of to eat, though sanctioned by the lexicons, has now become obsolete. Perhaps Bhasa is one of the few writers who uses the word in this peculiar sense of eating when the Vidūṣaka in his opening speech in the Chārudatta ~~in his opening speech in the~~ where he remarks that Chārudatta's poverty has made him dine out usually - अन्यत्र भोजनात् भोजनं नास्त्यिवास्मै न भोजनं. The Bhagavadgītā II.71 विहाय कामान्यः सर्वान्पुमांश्चरति निःस्पृहः is another similar context (cf गोष्ठीमध्ये स्थितामार्तमनन्तीं तृणं नखं - Rām. Ayod. 114.19).

Similarly the verb विचारयति has been used in the more ancient sense of 'consider' twice - विचारय

In the description of Kashmir in Nilamata Purana Verse 20,
देवालय is used in the sense of ~~Swarga~~ -

स्त्रीभिश्च सुकुमाराभिर्देवालयसमश्रियम् ।
दुष्टैर्भुजङ्गैर्दुर्लङ्घ्यमदृष्टाशैर्विवर्जितम् ॥

But verse 25 uses the word in the sense of a temple
also: तत्र नद्यस्तथा पुण्याः पुण्यानि च सरांस्यपि ।
देवालया महापुण्याः तेषां चैव तथाश्रमाः ॥

गणिका त्वं मार्गजातिकलेव (मालविका I.17) and विशाय सं राग
तवागोपुत्रम (कलिमा. V. 19). Exactly similarly, the word दर्शनं
is used in the earlier sense of an opinion and has
nothing to do with a philosophical system by which the
devotee sees the Almighty (as वेदान्तदर्शनं). On p 3, in
Svapna I (Devathan) we read - दूत! भो, सविज्ञानमहं
दर्शनम् - which simply means 'his views show full
understanding or sympathy', exactly as in Kautilya,
who sometimes sums up his views as इति कौटिलीयं
दर्शनम्. The word देवकुल also tells a similar tale
in Bhāsa's Pañcarātra I.4 - [तं] तो कहुदाकरेहु तकं
देवकुलं तु गुरुं: Here it means heaven and not
temple as in classical Sanskrit, Hindi and all
the Dravidian Vernaculars. Similar is the word
सदयमो, the older sense of which seems to have been
somehow remembered in the Amarakosa paraphrasing
it as दृष्टरजाः. Evidently the word according to
Bhāsa refers to a young woman in the plenitude
of her sex-appeal (perhaps referred to as such in
some Kāmaśāstra treatise prior to Vātsyāyana).

Kaikeyi is one such woman according to him. Vālmīki also uses the word in an exactly similar sense since Kausalyā or Sumitrā, who were long past the menopause stage and who could bear children only because of the supernatural pāyasa are not at all referred to by this word. The Alankārasāstra describing a [illegible] preserves this peculiar sense. Bhāsa uses the word in the masculine gender also in the sense of a strong person using his arms alone as weapons, one who is [illegible] Krimināka II.11. Most of Bhāsa's heroes, Bhāsa, Bhīma, Abhimanyu, Ghatotkacha, Duryodhana, Balarāma, and Udayana are all such stalwart 'madhyamas' and Bhāsa himself might have been one!

It will not be out of place to quote here the conclusions arrived at by the late Dr V.S. Sukthankar in his article on Bhāsa studies: 'No playwright of the classical age who aspired not to pass for an ignoramus would to such a degree indulge in a license which was little more than an unequal confession of incompetence. If therefore, we attempted to find for our group a place within the framework

of the classical drama, we should first have to account for this apparent reaction of the classical drama implied by the occurrence of the solecisms pointed out above. The foregoing investigation leads to the inevitable conclusion that the Sanskrit of the verse included in these dramas .... reflects a stage of literary development preceding the works of Kālidāsa and Bhavabhūti. .. The Prākṛit of these dramas revealed in an equally forcible manner a stage of development of Middle Indian dialects older than that preserved in the classical drama. It also betrays its affinities with the Prākṛit of the fragments of Aśvaghoṣa's dramas. The Sanskrit of the metrical portions of our plays is found to be linked with the language of the epics.

— pp 111, 112 Analecta, 1945, published by the Sukthankar Memorial Edition Committee, Poona.

The Tamil poem Kirandai yāl poem 2 has a line which is translatable as: You are, they say, the younger born to the one white as conch; You are indeed the younger brother of வெள்ளையான் = the white one = Baladeva; to him that wears dark garments and wears the palmyra for his flag, some say you are older; to them indeed you are the older of the twin. This context makes the one with body white as conch Balarāma or rather Baladeva as the Supreme Being; the weapons of விஷ்ணு are also described in lines 28-58 in poem 3. After describing புருஷோத்தம and referring to திருவிக்கிரமன் & கோவிந்தனாகி கிருஷ்ணன், the reference to the மேகவர்ணன் in lines 81-84 are as follows: கோதி = கிருஷ்ணன் of the red eye, வெள்ளை (white one), with black eyes, புரை = புருஷோத்தம் of green colour, & மாமை (அமிர்தம்) of yellow green body. திருமாலை திருமாலை stanza 44 also describes these 4 வர்ணங்கள்.

Chapter VI — More peculiarities of Bhāsa.

i) Viṣṇu's four colours in the four yugas:

I now propose to focus the attention of scholars on some peculiarities which have not been so far noticed. Firstly there is the question of the colours in the Nandi-śloka of the Bālacharita:

शङ्खेन्दुरजतप्रभुः पुरा कृतयुगे ब्रह्मा तु नारायणः
त्रेतायां त्रिपदार्पितत्रिभुवनो विष्णुः सुवर्णप्रभः
दूर्वाश्यामनिभः स रावणवधे रामो युगे द्वापरे
नित्यं यो ऽञ्जनसन्निभः कलियुगे सः पातु दामोदरः॥

These colours of Viṣṇu in the four successive ages of the world present a problem: white like the conch and milk in Kṛta, yellow when he measured the earth in this three steps in the Tretā, green like the dūrvā grass in the Dvāpara while killing Rāvaṇa, and black as collyrium in the Kali when he is named as Dāmodara. White, yellow, green, and black colours in the four avatāras, Nārāyaṇa, Vāmana, Rāma and Kṛṣṇa. Here it would be pertinent for us to note that Rāma is associated by Bhāsa with the Dvāpara age while the Purāṇas usually fix him with the Tretā yuga.

Of course he refers to 2 more avatāras, those of Narasimha and Varāha in the Kaṃsavadha and Hiraṇyāksa Vadha stories and these seem to be the only six he refers to and from the way in which he speaks of only four in the four yugas here, one is tempted to regard them as the earliest to be conceived as avatāras. In this connection, it would be pertinent to refer to the famous Gītā Verse paritrāṇāya sādhūnāṃ vināśāya ca duṣkṛtām | dharmasaṃsthāpanārthāya saṃbhavāmi yuge yuge ॥ IV. 8. The compound, from yuge yuge is prati-yugam and signifies 'in every yuga', and here also by implication, the avatāras seem to be only four, for the 4 yugas respectively. (In this context, it would be interesting to note that the four words, kṛta, treta, dvāpara, kali; pāvara, nardita and kata refer in Vedic literature to the different 'throws' in dicing, one, two, three, four from the lowest to the highest and then again in the reverse order. Even as late as the Chāndogya Upaniṣad I. i. 'Even as the lower throws of the dice are consummate in the highest throw (एतं हि सर्वे अभिसंपन्नं भवति) so to this man whatever good that beings do all is consummated in him'. Perhaps the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa Vol. IV p 72 (1906 Edn) is one of the earliest passages where the word yuga occurs in the modern sense:

In the Mahābhārata Vana parva तीर्थयात्रापर्व 152 Adhyāya Hanumān explains to his brother Bhīma that Viṣṇu is शुक्ल in Kṛta yuga (verse 18), त्रेतायां रक्तां याति जनार्दन (verse 25) द्वापरे पीतां याति विष्णु (verse 28), तामसं युगमासाद्य कृष्णो भवति केशवः (verse 35).

कलिः शयानो भवति संजिहानस्तु द्वापरः ।
उत्तिष्ठंस्त्रेता भवति, कृते संपद्यते चरन् ॥

and Bhasa seems to be another such early writer. The Mṛcchakaṭika II.9 seems to remember the older sense of the dicing throw when it says treta kṛta cavavah; that the gambler loses his entire property as a result of this dice throw. The Chandogya upanisad IV.1.4 refers to one defeated in gambling as कृतायजित्वा. The Bhāgavata Purāṇa X Skandha, Sixth Adhyāya VIII.13 in the context where Śrīṅga supplies the reason why he names Balarāma and Kṛṣṇa as such remarks आसन्वर्णास्त्रयो ह्यस्य गृह्णतोऽनुयुगं तनूः । शुक्लो रक्तस्तथा पीत इदानीं कृष्णतां गतः ॥ In the same context a bit earlier, in III. 20, Vasudeva praises the baby Kṛṣṇa as soon as it is born: स तं विरोजयन्सूतिगृहं स्वभाया विभर्षि शुक्लं खलु वर्णमात्मनः । सर्गादौ रक्तं रजसोपबृंहितं कृष्णं च वर्णं तमसा जनात्यये ॥ Here the colours are only 3, yellow being omitted and the colours are only such as correspond to the three guṇas Sattva, rajas and Tamas. But in the previous context, the colours, white, red, yellow, and black are mentioned as in Bhasa or in the Gītā. The same Bhāgavata XI, 5, 27 द्वापरे भगवान् श्यामः पीतवासाः निजायुधः । श्रीवत्सादिभिरङ्कैश्च लक्षणैरुपलक्षितः ॥ refers to the द्वापरयुगावतार as being green in colour, agreeing with Bhāsa. In that context,

further down, the colours are white (23rd Yuga), red (24), green (27) and black (32). Here the difference between Bhāsa and Bhāgavata might be noted, and even in the Bhāgavata itself, the earlier context would refer to white, red, yellow and black, but in XI Skandha, the colour for the dvāpara is green and not yellow. The red may be absent in Bhāsa's Balacharita, but we might assign the colour to the 2 avatāras Varāha and Narasimha, referred to in the Primārāka and Kumārāsāra Nāndis since in both these Vishnu tears up the two rākṣasas and is literally bathed in their red colour. The Mahābhārata Vanaparva 192nd chapter 31st verse also refers to these colours: श्वेतः कृतयुगे वर्णः त्रेतायुगे तथा रक्तो द्वापरमासाद्य कृष्णः कलियुगे तथा॥ This colour problem reminds us of a similar story in the Bhārata epic in the Karna Parva 35th chapter where the white good people and the black villains are compared to Hamsas and Kākas or yet again the Hamsatirtha and the Vāyasa tirtha introduced similarly in Bhāgavata I.5.10. तद्वायसं तीर्थमुशन्ति सन्तः न यत्र हंसा निरमन्युशिक्षयाः

2) Nilasneha. This colour problem leads us to another very interesting word नीलस्नेह in the Kharudatta III.12. तथा विभवमन्दोऽपि जन्मभूमिं न पेशलः। स्नेहं विक्रयकालेऽपि नीलस्नेहेन रक्षति॥ Sri Ganapati Sastrin understood this word metaphorically and explained: नीलो नीलीरागः, तत्सदृशः स्नेहः, दृढस्नेह इत्यर्थः। नीलीरागो हि वस्त्रादावाकल्पं नापैति, तद्वदनपायः स्नेहः नीलस्नेह इत्युक्तः। यादवाभ्युदय, also called Vaijayanti, written by a Vaiṣṇavite saint of Kāñchi in the 11th cen A.D. paraphrases the word as स्थिरप्रेम a steady affection, the Amarakośa having nothing to say about it. The Vaijayanti Comment as found in Oppert's Edn of 1893 (p.203) is नीलीरागः स्थिरप्रेम, हरिद्रारागः तु। अस्थिरप्रेमा॰। In other words he supplies us the interesting information that unsteady affection is assigned the haridrā colour. Bharata in his Nāṭyaśāstra K.M Edn XXI.65 refers to this नील as the strongest of the colours — वर्णेषु तु नीलः सर्वे नीलस्नेहं हि कीर्तितं॥ The same Bharata in VI.47-48 associates different colours with different rasas, but this has nothing to do with our context. The only other place where this नीलस्नेह occurs seems to be the

passage in the Sāhityadarpaṇa where the affection of Rama and Sita is referred to by this term न नीलिं इवाभते यन्नापैति प्रेम मनोरागे। तन्नीलीरागमारभ्यानि यथा श्रीरामसीतयोः Apte in his dictionary explains the term as affection as unchangeable as the colour of the indigo, unalterable or unswerving attachment. Strangely enough, Mṛcchakaṭika, omits this verse as though to avoid trouble.

3) ज्येष्ठा - The Balacharita towards the end of Act I, makes Vasudeva look at his house and remark: दृष्टं एतत् दृश्यते। कोऽसौ गृहे ज्येष्ठाभिः इव दृश्यते। दुःसहस्य देव्याः गृहे निवासः इव दृश्यते. This ज्येष्ठा seems to be the elder sister Alakṣmī referred to in the Śrī Sūkta of the Ṛgveda, as being ready to destroy, while the younger sister Śrī or Lakṣmī is the goddess of Fortune. In this context, the compound is explained as ज्येष्ठया अधिष्ठितं; while if the explanation is given as ज्येष्ठेन अधिष्ठितं, the sense might be that the eldest appropriated the entire property only to deceive the younger brothers of their share in the patri-

-mony. This was done for example by Duryodhana in the Pancharatra - Bhasa's deviation from the epic is to be noted here. The Dharmasastras retained that the eldest should, as a matter of duty, afford the younger brothers the needed protection and shelter. Manu, for example, decreed ज्येष्ठ एव तु सर्वान् भ्रातॄन् पितृवत् पालयेत् । ज्येष्ठे च पितृवद् वृत्तिं सर्वे कुर्युः पितरि यथा ॥ He also decrees in the same context that if the eldest in some cases denied his younger brother the needed shelter, he should be forthwith deprived of his privileged enjoyment of the entire paternal property यो ज्येष्ठो विनिकुर्वीत सर्वान् भ्रातॄन् यवीयसः । सोऽज्येष्ठः स्यादभागश्च विनियोज्यश्च राजभिः ॥ and Bhasa seems to paraphrase the word विनिकुर्वीत by वञ्चित when he made Rama say - अहं च तं परिशङ्कामि वञ्चितो भ्रातरो मया Pratima I.14, that his not getting the kingdom as a ज्येष्ठ was advantageous to him inasmuch as he would not be then accused of deceiving his younger brothers.

4) Early idioms. We may also note some peculiar idioms, the like of which are not usually met with in later classical literature as in Kalidasa, Bhavabhuti etc.

1) अनुगृहीता मां कुरु = please make me strong by complying with my request - Pratijñā IV. p.103.

2) अहं त्वया प्रसादी कृतः ? = Have I pleased you? - Pancha I. p. 383.

3) अयमभिलाषस्तु न मे मनसि - The term of address as 'O sage' being not usual for me, does not fit in my mind - Svapna I. p. 3.

5) Religious Atmosphere: The atmosphere in which these dramas are steeped deserves particular notice. The youngsters always make it a point to prostate themselves before the elders as a matter of course; the upaspardśa or the holy or ceremonial sipping of the waters after any impurity as a sneeze or weeping being strictly enforced also should be noted. One of the dramas speaks of a Sakuntha Yajna, evidently a variety of yajna that was being celebrated in those days. The habition of yajnas that were performed at night - which was remembered by Kālidāsa in Sakuntala II in the sacrifice that Dusyanta-dāsa

was asked to protect for a few nights [illegible] — was well known in the time of the Ramayana. Vishvāmitra there requested Dasaratha to spare his son to protect his 'Dasarātra' sacrifice. The same tradition seems to be implied in Bhāsa's Pancharātra yajna where curiously the plot of the drama is also made to cover the same number of nights as was required for the duration of the sacrifice. The observance of the fasts and other religious vows, the performance of obsequial śrāddhas and ceremonial pitrtarpana and above all the lifting even of prostitutes into the affectionate family fold are some other noteworthy features.

Chapter VII — Valmiki and Bhasa.

The epics as known to Bhasa must have been in a rather fluid state just before their final and fixed redaction. Bhasa seems to have known some epic poets earlier than Valmiki and Vyasa though he does not refer to them expressly by name. Asvaghosa for example in his Buddhacharita I.43 seems to have known at least one such Bhagavana by name when he said वाल्मीकिरादौ च ससर्ज पद्यं जगत्प्रथं च रघवो महर्षिः and the Matsya Purana (chap LIII stanza 68 etc) refers to Brahma and Narada as having composed Ramapakhyanas which were later summarised by Valmiki

Lakshmi Venkateshwara Pasro (?)

वाल्मीकिना तु यत्प्रोक्तं रामोपाख्यानमुत्तमम्।
ब्रह्मणाभिहितं यच्च ज्ञानं नारदादिभिः॥
आहृत्य नारदाद्यैस्तैर्वाल्मीकिर्यत्पुरा पुनः
वाल्मीकिना च लोकेषु धर्मकामार्थसाधनम्।
एवं परम्परा: प्रोक्ता लोकेषु मत्स्यैः प्रकीर्तिताः॥

Brahma according to this context composed it elaborately in a 100 crore of Verses. Narada learnt it from him and reported to Valmiki about the same. Later he condensed it into five Pakhs. This fact seems to have been hinted at by Valmiki himself in the opening chapters of his immortal epic where also Brahma and Narada visit him just before he commenced writing down the epic. We will try to show in this and the following chapters that Bhasa's style links him with Pre-Christian Era authors like Valmiki, Vyāsa, Bhavata, Kautilya and Vātsyāyana and also with the earliest Dharmasastrakaras like Gautama, Apastamba, Manu and others.

Bhasa is such an ardent student of Valmiki and Vyāsa that his style is almost unconsciously full of their epic phrases and ideas. The title 'Pancharātra' was suggested to him by the Ayodhyākānda 62nd adhyāya verse 17 - वनवासस्य रामस्य पञ्चरात्रोऽद्य गच्छते । यः शोकोपहतो ...

पञ्चवर्षोपमो मम ॥ Kaikeyi's explanation in her slip of the 14 days into years when she asked for Ramas exile seems to have been suggested to Bhasa by Bhima's arguing with his elder brother in Chapter 9 of the Vanaparva (Kumbak. Ed.) Verses 23 et seq. In the course of the argument, he urges that there is a little authority to regard the day and the night together as one year — अहोरात्रं महाराज कथं संवत्सरो मतः। तथैव वेदयज्ञं स्मृत्वा निर्मितो विधिः। ... यदि वेदाः प्रमाणं ते द्विसाहस्रं समभ्युत। त्रयोदशाब्दितः कालो नामतो परिनिष्ठितः॥ In the context, he urges that if they spend 13 full days and nights, it could legally be tantamount to 13 years and the period of their exile would be ingeniously over.

Kalidasa is very punctilious about following Manu's rule — ब्राह्मणं कुशलं पृच्छेत् क्षत्रबन्धुमनामयं in all the contexts where he makes others greet a Brahmin or a Kshatriya e.g. in the Act I of the Sakuntala the sage-disciples of Kanva greet Dushyanta with an inquiry of his 'anamaya' and the king in reply enquires about

Kanva's Kusala. But Valmiki who flourished centuries before Manu or Kalidasa is never bothered about this rule. In Bālakāṇḍa II.25 (Kumbak ed.) Valmiki greets Brahma with an 'anāmaya' prasna-pranamya vidhivacchainam praṣṭvānāmayamavyayam. In the same kanda further on, when Dasaratha greets Viśvāmitra a Brahmin sage, both the king and the sage mutually enquire about each other's कुशलं. Similarly Vasiṣṭha is also greeted with a कुशलं. Similarly Bhasa also jumbles up the kusala and anāmaya enquiries promiscuously as for example in Dūtavākya 19th verse - दामोदरजो वायुसुतश्च भीमो भ्रातार्जुनो मे त्रिदशेन्द्रसूनुः। यमौ च तावश्विसुतौ विनीतौ सर्वे सहृद्याः कुशलोपपन्नाः॥

Though they are Kṣatriyas Kṛṣṇa replies pretending not to have understood the insinuation (that the Pandavas are illegitimate sons of gods and so not at all entitled to patrimony), affectionately reciprocating the sentiments and continues - अर्थे तु राज्ये शरीरे च सहृद्भिः आत्मनि च कुशलमाशासे च पुनः. From this we is tempted to conclude that Bhasa might have lived very close to Valmiki when the Dharmasastra rule about the कुशल

and अतीतमर्यादः had not become very strict then.

There is a Rāmopākhyāna parva, 18th sub-section in the Vanaparva of the Mahābhārata Comprising of the chapters from 274 to 293 (Kumbak Edn). This differs in important respects from the Ramayana and we cannot hazard any guess as to whether this was summarised from Valmiki's version. It is not necessary for us to examine the relative priority of these two versions, but it is interesting to note that Bhasa's story in the Pratimā and the Abhiseka follows the Rāmopākhyāna of Vyāsa rather than Valmiki's, at least in one or two important points. After Indrajit's death, Bhasa makes Ravana dash out to Sitā to kill her with one stroke of his sword when a servant intervenes and declares (Abhiseka V end) - अवश्यं स्त्रीवधो न कर्तव्यः and according Ravana starts out for the famous Rama Ravana Yuddha. Adhyaya 290 of the Rāmopākhyāna (Bhva Verses 27 et seq) are

रावणः शोकमोहार्तो वैदेहीं हन्तुमुद्यतः।
... खड्गमादाय क्रुद्धात्मा जवेनाभिपपात ह॥
ते दृष्ट्वा तस्य दुर्बुद्धेः अनिश्चयः पापनिश्चयं।
उभयामास संक्रुद्धे ... न स्त्रियं हन्तुमर्हसि

p 458 - Kumbakonam Edn.

I quote only one instance to prove my point. The careful reader can easily find out many other correspondences between Bhasa's version and this story of the Bhavata epic. I want to draw the attention of scholars to this version of the Rama story and also to other versions current in different languages for example Adhyatma Rāmāyana, Padma Purana versions in Sanskrit, Kambar in Tamil, Torave in Kannada, Bhaskara in Telugu, Rāmacharita mānanas in Hindi etc; in all of them, the story is almost similar, particularly in making Kaikeyi beg of Dasaratha for the two boons; but in Bhasa alone, the kingdom is spoken of as rājyaśulka, as having been her bridepriee promised to her at the time of her marriage. This peculiarity alone is sufficient warrant for us to guess that Bhasa seems to have known other versions of the story as were current in his days, but which evidently became completely over-shadowed by Valmiki almost to the point of supercession.

Some of the striking similarities in thought and expression are put in parallel columns with the context (references being to the Kumbakonam edn of the epic and to Devadhar edn)

Bhasa

अङ्गे मे स्पृशा कौसल्ये न तां पश्यामि चक्षुषा।
रामं प्रति गता बुद्धिरद्यापि न निवर्तते। प्रतिमा II.
18 - Dying Dasaratha says this.

रामलक्ष्मणयोर्मध्ये दीप्ततेजोऽग्निमैथिली।
Pratima II.15 - Same context

रत्नाकरकुलजे वाल्मीकिवचनं विचारयन्तं वने रामं ते स्पृशन्ति यथासुखम्।
Pratima II.12 - Same context.
Dasaratha entreating the winds to touch him after touching Rama in forest.

दैवं पुरुषकारेण व्यर्थीकर्तुमहं क्षमे।
Balā III.14 - Ravana says he will frustrate fate

नेपथ्ये तौ साधुवाद-वाक्यं नैवाण्यन्ते स्त्रीविशेषैः।
विमुक्तः Svapna I.16 - Where Bhasa compares Udayana & Vasavadatta to a loving couple

अनाहारे तुल्यः प्रबलरुदितो भूतनयनः -
Svapna I.17 where Udayana is pathetically described.

भर्तृनाथा हि नार्यः - प्रतिमा I.25 -

Valmiki

चक्षुषा त्वां न पश्यामि रजस्तिर्मेव विद्यते।
(Priyamvada Hanuman 65th chap. 65.

न तां पश्यामि कौसल्ये साधु मां पश्य मातृका।
रामं ते दुःखजा बुद्धिरद्यापि न निवर्तते॥ अयोध्या
- 42nd sarga - 34th verse.

अङ्गैरङ्गानि संगम्य सीतायाः समनुव्रजन्।
पृष्ठतोऽनुगमिष्यामि सीतां त्वां चानुपालयन्॥
अयोध्या LII. 96th verse.

अङ्गतः प्रथमो रामः मध्ये सीता सुमध्यमा।
पृष्ठतस्तु धनुष्पाणिर्लक्ष्मणोऽनुगमिष्यति॥
अयोध्या XI.

वाहि वातः यतः कान्ता तां स्पृष्ट्वा मामपि स्पृश।
स्पृश - युद्धकाण्ड. V.6.
Rama asks the forest winds to blow up to Sita & later return to him.

सीता संश्रितवाताया न दैवं पर्युपासते।
दैवं पुरुषकारेण यः समर्थः प्रबाधितुम्।
न दैवेन विपन्नार्थः पुरुषः सोऽवसीदति॥
अयोध्या - XXIV - Lakshmana hints operating against fate.

स्पृष्टं नरवरेणैव नरेन्द्रपत्नीं जनकात्मजाम्।
कृपया दर्शयामास - सुन्दर XIV.30 - Hanuman comparing Sita to a pitiful woman

इयं सा यत्कृते रामः स्तूयते भिन्नसेतुभिः।
कारुण्येनावशीर्णेव शोकेन मदनेन च॥
सुन्दर - XV.44 - Where Hanuman sees Sita

राघवेऽहं न दैवं वैदेहि तं ते यत्नाद्विधास्ये क्षमम्।
Same context
भर्तृनाथा च रानि या; - अयोध्या - 117 - 24

1. Pāṇini might say that the mother's name could be adopted only in case the father's name was unknown - पितुरसंविज्ञाने मात्रा अपदेशः पुत्रस्य कुत्सी; but in the long distinguished lists of वंश as for example in the शतपथ ब्राह्मण no such कुत्सा could have been implied and Patañjali actually attributes this to an honourable custom गार्गीमातृः, वात्सीमातृः III. 340. Inscriptional records of the contemporary शुङ्ग & Andhra periods also confirm this by their adoption of matronymics as वात्सीपुत्र & माढरीपुत्र.

24 Sumitrā in the epic advises Lakṣmaṇa अयोध्यामटवीं विद्धि and the subjects declare अस्मिन्नरण्ये पुरं संभवतीवाहम् or अयोध्यापि भवेत्तस्या रामहीना वनं वनम्. Bharata makes us understand the idea most better when he declares in Rāmā III-24 – अयोध्या न विना अयोध्या सायोध्या यत्र राघवः. The epic fondly compares Rama to the moon and Bhāsa has also fondly repeated the same comparison and popularised the name Rāmachandra just as Bhavabhuti used the name Rāmabhadra. The epic makes Viśvāmitra call Rama affectionately as कौसल्यासुतः and Bhāsa also makes his heroes addressed as कौसल्यामातः, सुमित्रामातः (exactly as in the Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣad where people are referred to as गौतमीपुत्र, or पाराशरीपुत्र. Similarly the Sātavāhanas call themselves in the inscriptions गौतमीपुत्र. The Patañjali III. 360 refers similarly to people as वासिष्ठीमातः, गार्गीमातः. The use of the word मातृ in its peculiar sense exactly as in Valmiki has already been referred to. We might also compare the significance of the word "दारुक" in Valmiki and Bhāsa. This word has been

explained by Govindarāja as 'रक्षणीयं वस्तु' commenting on किष्किन्धा XLV 23

भवान् कलत्रं मत्प्राणं स्वामिभक्त्या व्यवस्थितः ।
स्वामी कलत्रं सैन्यस्य जातिरक्षा परन्तप ॥
नसीतां कलत्रवन्तात परिपाल्यः सदा भवान् ॥

Bhavabhūti's Pratimā I.4 सर्वं हि सैन्यमनुरागमृते कलत्रं - 'Every soldier in the army is to be carefully protected like the wife - if not it becomes mercenary and is devoid of loyal devotion' is exactly similar to the epic usage. Similarly in the Prima Anka I. (P115 - Devadhar) we read:

राजा - किमनया कलत्रम् ?

भूतिकः - सर्वसहितं कलत्रं सहायानीति ।

Obviously the reply of the Minister Vāyu has instituted secret inquiries into the 'Mandalā's (?) antecedents, means,' he has a family (to protect), but he has himself not taken a wife.

Epic phrases[2] like आचिरेणैव कालेन, कमलाक्षि मेदिनी, शान्तिः कामानकोपश्च and soon - as noted by Dr V.S. Sukthankar in his 'Versification of Metrical Portions' in Studies in Bhāsa are too many to be individually noted. The scholar has also noted

2 भर्तृनाथस्य चरणौ वाः - Rām. Ayodh. - 117 - 25, is echoed in भर्तृनाथहि नाथः Pratimā I.25

sacrifice of grammar and avoidance of Sandhi rules and similar epic or ārṣa devices which are favouritely used in the Trivandrum Bhāsas and link him with the epic poets. He has also drawn attention to certain passages where unimportant time is mixed with fancy metres mostly lyrical e.g. Pañcharātra II. 27 to the end, Pratimā I 9 to 28, Madhyama 12 to 45th verse; these are rudimentary attempts at dramatisation which are not quite emancipated from the limitations of the epic prototype" - p. 99 Anālocana.

Chapter VIII - Vedavyāsa and Itihāsa

Sarvanātha of the Ikhok copperplate inscription of 533 A.D already styles the epic a शतसाहस्री संहिता and the epic tells us that without the upākhyānas, it was a चतुर्विंशतिसाहस्री संहिता or contained only 24,000 slokas. The northern version of the epic has, according to Hopkins' calculation 84,124 verses excluding Harivamśa. The Southern or the Kumbakonam recension has about 12,000 more verses, i.e. over 96,578 verses only and wants nearly 3,500 verses to make it a lakh. Evidently there must have been a time when there were many more episodes which might have been slowly dropped out for various reasons. It looks as though Bhāsa lived very soon after Vyāsa even before these episodes came to be slowly discarded.

One of such episodes seems to have been the Ghatotkacha episode dramatised in the Madhyama Vyāyoga Fragment, on Ghatotkacha's death, remarks in the epic, as we have it at present:

The Madhyamavyāyoga in which there is a fight between Ghatotkacha and his father Bhima seems to have been inspired by Bhima's encounter with his elder brother Hanuman in the Vanaparva Tirtha yātraparva chap 148 Kumbak Edn in which Bhima's further progress into the heavenly regions is blocked by the monkey. Just as Ghatotkacha is discomfited here, Bhima is discomfited in the epic and in the end both are happy.

In the Drona parva chaps 80-81 the attainment of गाङ्गपतीन्द्र

यदि द्रोणं नाहनिष्यत्कर्णः शस्त्रभृतां महान्।
मया वधोऽभविष्यत्स भीष्मसेनेर्दृढोत्कचः॥
मया न विहतः पूर्वं एष युष्माभिरेव च।
एष हि ब्राह्मणद्वेषी यज्ञद्वेषी च राक्षसः।
धर्मस्य लोप्ता पापात्मा तस्मादेष निपातितः॥

(Kumbak-Ed.: Drona Parva 182nd chap., 25, 26, 27 Verses.)

Evidently Bhasa in the Madhyamavyayoga seems to remember such an episode wherein Bhattacharya figures as a hater of yajnas and also of the Brahmins. As we have the epic at present, such episodes have been carefully pruned off.

In the same drama again, Bhima makes a remark which deserves to be carefully noted: अस्मि सङ्ग्रामसमर्थः. As everybody can see, Bhima refers to himself as having been blessed by Isvara first as Arjuna was blessed with the Pasupatastra. So perhaps there was an earlier version according to which both Arjuna and Bhima prayed and propitiated Siva; later, with the glorification of Arjuna alone, this penance of Bhima seems to have been forgotten. The Panchavatra III·12, कर्णोऽपि

तेन हारे विभु ॥ as already observed in Chapter II, refers to an 'astraparīkṣā in which Bhima also was tested exactly as he had another test for proving Arjuna's superiority. And it is quite possible that both Bhima and Arjuna also might have performed austerities to please Siva. Sri Madhva of the 12th century A.D, the famous Dvaitācārya, in his Mahābhāratatātparyanirnaya refers to Vyāsa's own sentences, but many of these 'own sentences' are not traceable in the extant editions of the epic. If this is the case with reference to such a late writer of the 12th cen, we can easily guess that with reference to a writer who was more than 12 centuries prior to him, many more such alterations could easily be traced.

There may be other variations from Vedavyāsa but we do not feel justified in arguing that they might represent lost or other recensions of the epic not preserved now. To take but one or two examples, the Panchavātha story of the war being dispensed with was only introduced by Bhasa in the wake of the message of good brotherliness or Sauhārdam for which he seems to have personally had a liking. The Urubhanga makes it clear for

so that he knew that the Kurupāndava yuddha had taken place. The new message of Ghatotkacha – not at all referred to in the epic – is again another offshoot of Bhasa's message to a warridden world of Sauhārdam and might have been suggested by Angada's dautyam in the sister epic. Similar is the deviation about Duryodhana's wives, the epic referring to only one Bhānumati; the son Durjaya whom we meet in Bhasa is not to be seen in the epic where Duryodhana's son is named Lakṣmaṇa and is far older than the lovely baby boy of Bhasa.

The Bhagavata purana cannot of course be ruled as Vyasa, even in the orthodox circles, the Vishnupurana is considered prior to the Bhagavata, but that is beside our point at present. We may, on this occasion, speak of a 'Bhagavata epic' of which we may declare the modern Bhagavata purana to be the legal descendant. This Bhagavata epic, if we could so call it, might have existed in Bhasa's time and might have been lost for us now. As we have it now, the Bhagavata refers to Krṣṇa as the 8th son of Devaki and refers to the asarīrāk as predicting the birth of Krṣṇa who would be his future killer. But Bhasa refers to Krṣṇa as the 7th and not the 8th 'dirghāyur' or son of Devaki and accounts

for Kamsa's death by introducing a Madhuka Ṛṣi's curse. There are other minor variations as Nandagopa being condemned under constant chains; these chains mysteriously fall off when he takes the Divine Baby Kṛṣṇa into his arms. Bhasa's story does not refer to the Rāsa Krīḍa of the later Harivaṃśa or the Bhāgavata Purāṇa and is satisfied with referring to Kṛṣṇa's dance as the Hallīsaka dance of the cowherds. If some contemporaries also come in, they are Ghoṣa sundari, Vanamālā, Chandrarekhā and Mṛgākṣī and Rādhā does not all come into the picture. The story as narrated in Bhasa agrees in some important particulars with some Jaina legends as for example in Neminātha Purāṇa. Even here unfortunately for us, the Neminātha Purāṇa was composed in the 10th cen A.D, but it definitely seems to have had a far earlier Jaina version similar to the Buddhist Jātakas in the centuries slightly prior to the Christian Era. As a matter of fact, the Buddhist Ghaṭa Jātaka story of Kaṃsa Paṇḍita agrees with this to a certain extent.

section (b) - 'Ekāyana' This word occurring in Pratijñā I-7- इह खल्वेकायनरथेन [illegible] is explained by

वनपर्व - तीर्थयात्रापर्व - 148 - Kumbak Edn. 72.

Bhima's path is being blocked by Hanuman

आसन्नकायने मार्गे कदलीविषममण्डिते।

भ्रातुर्भीमस्य रक्षार्थं तं मार्गमवरुध्य वै॥ 4c.

161 Vana Parva Verse 42 - तदेकायनमासाद्य विषमं

भीमदर्शनम्। बहुतालोच्छ्रयं शृंगमारुरोह महाबलः॥

Prof. Devadhar in his glossary of difficult words as अशक्तिक or helpless, but this deserves to be better interpreted as 'standing at bay'. Bhasa, as a very close student of the epics, seems to have had his cue for interpreting the word thus from the way in which Vyasa used it in the Godāyuddha 59th chap. Verses 13 et seq. The slokas are

सुयोधनः कृती वीर प्राकाम्यगतिरत्नवान् ।
पुनरावर्तमानानां भ्रमतां जीवितैषिणाम् ।
अन्तमारिक्षेषणां प्राकाम्यगतिना हि ते ।
साहसोत्पतितानां च निराशानां च जीविते ।
न शक्यमगतिः प्राप्तुं शक्रेणापि धनञ्जय ॥ ८८

This word is explained as प्राकाम्य philosophy of the

आदर्शधर्म. His epic in XIII.124 has yet another lovely story about the nature of ādarśa dharma which Bhasa has utilised in his Bālacharita. The story can be briefly narrated thus: Once Prahlada who had conquered Indra subjugated the entire Svarga. Indra cleverly disguised himself as a devoted disciple and began to serve Prahlada as a devoted disciple. After some time, the guru was so completely impressed with his 'disciple's' virtues that he straightway promised to give him a boon. The false disciple at once asked him 'How did you acquire your heavenly kingdom?' Prahlāda replied

first of the 12 subjects already shown by Vasudeva in Vishnu Purana when he comes to his famous enlightenment XIII.1.2

My Virtues invested in me the necessary strength to conquer heaven'. The disciple at once prayed for a gift of those very virtues. Prahlada's Suvratā was snatched away from him and later he could be easily dislodged from Svarga. The moment Prahlada granted the boon, a resplendent Śakti emerged from his body. Prahlada asked the resplendent form in dismay 'Who are you?' (even as Kamsa accosts his Śrī which leaves his body because of Viṣṇu's order). The Śakti replied 'I am Prahlada's Virtue, I am bound for my new home'. After a few minutes, another effulgent light issued out of the body again. Again Prahlada asked that who it was. The reply was 'I am the Dharmadevatā in Prahlada's body'. 'Where are you bound?' was Prahlada's next question and the reply was 'When Virtue and good thoughts have deserted your body, my place to live is gone'. The glories themselves are so lovely:

वृत्तं प्रह्लाद मां विद्धि यत्रस्थास्यामि ततो ह्यहम्।
नास्मिन्गते महाशक्तेः द्वारं तस्य निरर्गलम्॥
पृष्टश्चाहं त्वकं विद्धि यतो वृत्तमहं ततो ह्यहम्॥
इत्युक्त्वा प्रययौ तत्र यतो वृत्तं तदाधिपम्।

ततः प्रभामयी देवी शरीरान्तस्य निर्ययौ ।
तामपृच्छत्स दैत्येन्द्रः सा श्रीरित्येनमब्रवीत् ।
अधितास्मि स्वयं वीर तवाद्य सत्यपराक्रमे ।
त्वयात्यक्तो गमिष्यामि बलं ह्यनुगतो ह्यहम् ॥
ततो ऽयं प्राकृतोऽसीत्य हृदि सा महात्मनः (exactly as per Kansa)
अपृच्छत्स ततो दैत्यः क्व यास्यसि कमालये (Lakshmi's reply)
त्वं हि सत्यपरा देवि लोकस्य परमा धरि
शीलेन हि त्रयो लोका त्वया धार्यन्ते निर्जिताः
तद्विज्ञाय सुरेन्द्रेण तव शीलं हृतं प्रभो
दत्तैः सार्धं तथा वृत्तं बलं चैव तथा ह्यहम्
शीलमूला महाप्राज्ञे तथा नीतिस्त्र संज्ञयः ॥ etc

Anybody can see that this story must have been at the back of Bhasa's mind when he wrote the memorable bloodcurdling scene in which Kamsa sees a number of Chandala girls entering his mind after his Sri had deserted him. The scene is so bewildering and weird and is perhaps without a peer in world literature, being more bloodcurdling than the ghostscene in Hamlet.

Enough has been said to suggest Bhasa's proximity to Vyasa. One could also adduce in this connection the clever utilisation of the सदानन्दवित-of the Bhagavad Gita VIII. 6 in the dying.

heros Duryodhana, Vali and more particularly Dasaratha. The Kausitaki Upanisad had declared that the wise scholar goes to a very different sort of 'Brahma' heaven being escorted by nymphs or Apsarasis after his death and Bhasa cleverly connected this with his heroic warrior implicitly dying and attaining Vrabhanga'. The Upanisads also speak of यान्तिनस्तस्य देवतिं and Dasaratha's constant thinking of his son in the II act of the Pratima just before his death is the highest type of Ekānta Bhakti taught in our Vedanta or in the devotional songs of a Purandara Dāsa or Saint Tyāgarāja.

1. The Rāmāyana for example speaks of a Vimāna which comes to escort the soul of the dead king killed by Dasaratha on the occasion of the hunt before his marriage. Ayodhyākāndā 64th Chapter - 51 - [illegible]

Chapter IX — Bhavata and Bhasa.

We are in doubt as to whether to call this chapter Bhavata and Bhasa or Bhasa and Bhavata since the question of relative chronology is yet undecided. But since the claim of Bhavata (and also of Vatsyāyana in our ~~later~~ next chapter) as a muni has been universally recognised as against Bhasa's whose claim is only sought to be established in these pages, we placed Bhavata (and Vatsyāyana in our next chapter) the more honoured place.

The word 'Bhavata Vākya' is not found at the end of five dramas of this series: Bālacarita, Madhyamavyāyoga, Dūtaghaṭotkacha, and Karṇabhāra, but is found at the end, as is quite usual with all other Sanskrit dramas, of the other eight dramas. But this fact by itself cannot enable us to conclude that Bhasa has known of the existence of Bhavata. Actually, the scribes themselves might have started the custom of writing this word at the end of every drama long after, but even on this supposition, it

is inexplicable why it should be absent at the end of the five dramas.

'Lokasya bhavan nāṭyam' is Bharata's first definition of drama; in other words, it must, according to him, portray the various phases of human life exactly as they are found in society. Evidently when Bharata framed his rules of dramaturgy, dramas had not as yet become idealist in outlook as they now are and suitable as per rules. Bhasa's dramas alone - and following him Śūdraka of course - are realist inasmuch as they depict life exactly at all levels, and the conclusion is therefore clear that they should have been composed long before the dramaturgic rules became strictly enforced. The critics who came after Bharata seem to have emphasised the 'hitopadeśajananam' (verse 79 I ch. after Baroda ed. for Anandāśrama Series 1894) or 'kīrtiprasādajananam' (verse 81 Kāvya Mala Ser.) found in Bharata's definition of nāṭyam almost immediately after in the same context. It is inconsistent with this lokopadeśa aspect which would be obviously out of place if the mirroring of life alone were the criterion, the critics soon after Bharata evidently argued, the realistic

outlook should be completely discarded. It is also interesting to note that Bharata refers to a Sthapaka Sutradhāra who enters the stage after the exit of the Nāndī Sutradhāra who performs the purvaranga and departs (VI.150 K.M.Edn.) and whose personality is similar to the regular sutradhāra. This second Sutradhāra is referred to by Bharata as prastavanapratisamskārakah sutradhāra. Though here 2 Sutradhāras were there usually, Bharata might have felt that the first one was not really necessary for the drama and he might have argued that some real purpose was served by the second who completed the prologue. Here also Bharata's lead might have been followed by Bharata's immediate successor, whoever he was, if he might not have been Bharata himself.

Exactly similarly, the prohibition of death scenes and battlescenes on the stage as found in Bharata XVIII. 19 and 20 (K.M. Edn) seems to have been the result of an overemphasis of the idealistic outlook popularised by the critics Lata, Kan Bharata. This is rather inconsistent with Bharata's own statement in X.83 and 84, where he remarks:

न भेद्यं नापि च छेद्यं न चापि रुधिरस्रुतिः।
रङ्गे प्रहरणं कार्यं न चापि वधघातनम्॥
राज्ञा मात्रेण कर्तव्यं शस्त्राणां मोक्षणं बुधैः।
अशस्त्राभिनयोपेतं कुर्यात् छेद्यं विधानतः॥

This definitely implies that some mimic battles at least were sometimes permitted on the stage. The very fact that dramatic scenes like Thāyaṅga or Samavakāra or utsṛṣṭikaṅka dramatising military valour are referred to by Bharata is clear proof for the fact that in the beginning, depiction of battle scenes and death on the stage was not uncommon. Many of these early dramas like the Thāyaṅgas or Samavakāras are now lost for us, but curiously enough, Bhasa alone preserves for us some of the earliest specimens of dramas in which such heroic scenes culminating in the death of some character on the stage are represented. Patanjali's testimony is clear that in his day the Sobhanikas or the dramatic troupes represented Kamsa's death on the stage and Bhasa, almost a contemporary of his, makes his Duryodhana and Vāli die on the stage. As a matter of fact, the early Bhasa alone preserves for us some of the out of

-the way dramatic types almost exactly as Bharata speaks of them (like Madhyamavyayoga and Punchavatha, a Sama-Vakāra) and one is tempted to hazard the guess that he must have flourished sufficiently long before the immediate followers of Bharata succeeded in forbidding them from the stage altogether.

The XIII 179 K.M. Sd.Ed. = 215 et seq. Bombay (Ed.) refers to the way in which kings and gods were to be offered simhāsanas, priests and ministers cane chairs, women seats for Brahmins, a seat prepared from Munda or Bengal madder for queens, carpets for princes etc. But in the Dūta Vākya when Duryodhana requests Bhisma, Drona, his uncle Sákuni, Vaikarsana, and Vasudeva to be seated in the Durbar Hall for consultations, Drona is offered a Kurmāsana, Bhisma a Simhāsana, a charmāsana for his uncle, and the rest are requested to be conveniently seated in the Assembly according to the availability of the seats there. Here again Bhasa does not follow Bharata's directions and from this we cannot draw any inference whether Bhasa or Bharata was the earlier. Bhasa might not have been worried about particular seats for the different

castes.

Nor does the indecent and eccentric coxcomb, the Śakāra described by both Bhāsa and Bharata help us in settling the chronology in any way. Bharata declares that his gait must be queer on account of his ugly person; with peculiar and perhaps too lazy dress, with ugly limbs and flowing clothes and long garlands, his haughty and defiant glances associate him with persons of the lowest morality (Nāṭyaśāstra VII Verses 147-150 Baroda Ed.). He is called by that name as he pronounces the palatal sibilant श instead of the dental and the lingual sibilants. Bharata refers him to an uncivilised hilly tribe wandering in the hills. XVIII 50. and in XVIII. 105 refers to him as gaudily dressed दुःखसंरम्भः, easily irritated and as easily pacified कृपाभिनिवेशतः प्रसीदति, of very low morals अशीलः. Abhinavagupta informs us that another drama-Pratijñāvāsavatta of a Mahākavi Bhāsa of whom nothing else is known - describes another Śakāra by name Vindhyaketu. Kautilya does not know this word Śakāra, though he refers to a rāṣṭrapāla and a rāṣṭramukhya but only as provincial governors

Bhasa (and following him Śūdraka) makes his Śakāra the brother-in-law of the king - rājaśyālaḥ Saṃsthānaka always boasting that his sister is the king's wife, even to the point of intimidating others, even the woman he wants to wed. He is called in the Mṛcchakaṭika, the son of an unchaste woman by the lover and insurious companion, the vita, Kāṇaimātaḥ. Bhasa's Śakāra is really unique and might be an advance on Bharata's conception if he is not originally conceived. His definition of the Śakāra is given in Dhanudatta I. 16. [illegible] (Sanskrit Drama p. 292)

Vaidya has already suggested that Bhasa should have learnt a Nāṭyaśāstra since he has mentioned it in the Avimāraka. Whether this was identical with Bharata's work or not is a moot point, but Keith seems inclined to accept the identity. This fact is strengthened by the absolute silence of the Nāṭyaśāstra about the Mahārāṣṭrī Prākrit as the

case with Bhasa's dramas. Dandin in the 7th cen. A.D had already praised this Maharāstri Prākrit as the best Prākrit or 'prakṛṣṭam prākṛtam'. The attempt to identify the Dākṣiṇātya Prākrit of Bharata (K.M. XVII 52) with Maharāstri is ridiculed by Sri M. Ghosh in XXV Calcutta Dept of letters p.25. Another theory has been also put forward that Bhasa himself was the author of a Nāṭyaśāstra and preceded Bharata. Bhasa's salutation of Balarama for example in the Svapna is adduced in this connection particularly because this Balarama happens to be the presiding deity of the Tamilian stage in the early centuries of the Christian era.

The same writer has in that very article referred to the two 'extra' metres found in Bhasa and not dealt with in Bharata's Nāṭyaśāstra. Of these, the Upajāti is nothing but a combination of the Indravajrā and Upendravajrā already taught in the N.S. itself as the writer himself notes in connection with Asvaghoṣa (p.35 of the paid article); anupacchandasika is the only one metre not dealt with in Bharata and found in Bhasa. As I have remarked

already, I would draw the logical conclusion from the metrical analysis on p. 33 of the article and would arrange the chronology on his findings as Bhasa 2 extra metres (or really 1 only), Kālidāsa (5 extra), Aśvaghoṣa 7, Bhaṭṭi 8, Bhāravi 10, and Māgha 22. From this metrical analysis, the writer concludes that Bharata is slightly prior to Bhasa and I would add that Kālidāsa and Aśvaghoṣa follow in chronological order.

I propose now to compare in parallel columns the devatāmaṇḍala of Bharata and Bhasa. We find the same Sri Pathak's classification in the same article where he says he has classified the gods according to the system adopted by Hopkins in his Epic Mythology. The Śloka-Kārika idea of the Nāṭyaśāstra is utilised.

Bharata	Bhasa
I Lower Mythology.	I Nāgaloka or Pātāla: Abhi I.5; Kāliya: Bāla IV.
Serpents: I.10, 63 etc. II.8; III.27; IV.254 V.51.	Birds: Garuḍa = Hanuma = Kumbhakarna Bāla I.21: [illegible] Dūta Vā I.53 - Jaṭāyu Pratimā VI.22.
Birds: III.9, 27; Waters: I.88; III.7; IV.253	Waters: Samudra personified - appearing before dying heroes in Pratimā & Abhi I where Pāli sees Gangā with [illegible]
II Spirits	Pitṛs - Seen by dying heroes like Dasaratha
Pitṛs III.27; V.52.	Vālikasurya - Śrāddha Pratimā V.
Bhūtas I 8 & 92; III.8 etc; IV.11; V.54 VI.216.	Bhūta = highest God - Bāla II.10

Rākṣasas: I. 10; V. 47; XXIII 216

Piśāchas: I. 92; III 27; XXIII 216.

Yakṣas: I. 10 etc.; III 8

Asuras: I. 10, 63; III, 8; V. 46; XXII. 16; XXIII 216.

Rākṣasas: Bāla I. 1 518 Devāhan

Piśāchas "

Yakṣas - अशोकसुन्दरी नाम परिचारिणी - Svapna V. p. 43.

Vidyādharas: Agrim IV; Vidyādharas (3) descending [illegible] in Abhiṣ VI.

Chāndāla girls entering Kamsa's hall in Bāla II.

Asuras or sura-śatru - Karna I.

III. Eight Great Gods - [illegible]

Surya: I. 62, 85; II 5; III. 24.

Chandra: I. 84, II 5; III. 24; V. 51

Hutāśana or Agni - [illegible]

Vayu: I. 62; III. 25.

Yama: I 90; II 6; III 26; IV 253

Varuna I. 61; III 28; IV 253

Indra: I. 11; II 4; III 24; IV. 252

Lokapālas: I. 85; III 5; V 50.

Surya's horses: Karna 19; Agni escorts Sītā out of Fire - Abhiṣ VI - Agni = Hiranyakeśi.

Chandra - Pratimā V. 17 (= सोम).

Yama (= सूर्यपुत्र) Pratimā V. 17.

Varuṇa: appears in Abhiṣ IV & offers a path across the Sea to Rāma.

Indra (= Śakra) Pratimā V. 17; Maitryama 43; Urub 35; Abhiṣ I 3; II 18.

Dikpālas = Lokapālas only 4 (not 8) Pratimā V. 17.

IV - Host of Spirits

Gandharvas: I. 10; III 7; V. 46.

Apsarasas: I. 47; III. 7; V. 45.

Kāma: IV 252.

Aśvins: III. 5.

Marutas: I 85; III. 6.

Rudras: I 84; III 6, 26.

Viśvedevas: III. 26.

Āditya: I. 87.

Apsarasas escort flying horses to देवसभा Abhiṣ I end; Urub end.

Kāma: Svapna IV. 1

Aśvins: Deśāvāliya 19.

Rudra: Bāla III. 12 = शिव, [illegible] 43.

Gaṇeśa, whom we worship in the very beginning in any Tantric rite
is characterised by the epithet Vighna, & a Buddhist God was
created in Vighnāntaka; this God when represented in art is
seen trampling Gaṇeśa under his feet. The position of Gaṇeśa
in the Buddhist pantheon is under the feet of various Gods,
such as Mahāpratisāra, Parṇa śavarī, Aparājita etc.
The higher Gods like Brahma, Viṣṇu, Indra & Śiva are also
humiliated similarly. Their consorts also do not receive any
better treatment. Sītā, Hayagrīva etc are somehow represented
as flying away to escape the wrath of Buddhist Gods. Poor
Brahma has been more severely handled. His severed head with
faces & flying beards is mercilessly flourished by a number of
Buddhist Gods. — Glimpses of Vajrāyana
by B. Bhattacharya in Madras
Oriental Conference.

V Divine Seers

Bṛhaspati: III.4; XXXIV 79; XXXVI 52

Nārada: XXXVI 66.

VI Earthly seers.

Bala(deva): IV 254.

Nahuṣa: XXXVI 60, 64, 69

Sanatkumāra III.31.

VII Trivarṇas

Brahma: I.1, 61 etc; III.4; IV.1. XXXIII. 207.

Viṣṇu I 62; IV.41, 251; V.1m; XXXIII. 207, 238.

Śiva I.1, 93; IV.6, 16, 248; XXXIII 207.

Kārttikeya: I.94; III.4.

Gaṇeśa: III.9 (?)

VIII Goddesses

Sarasvatī: III.5, 25.

Lakṣmī: III.5, 25; IV 252

Umā = Pārvatī = Chandikā III.251; V 53, IV 246

Siddhi, Medhā, Smṛti, Mati III.5

Nīlā: I 90, III.6

Nārada: Bāla I; Brahm VI. p 180.

Skanda Bhārgava: Brahm VI. p 116 (carries the entire family of heroes.

Baladeva or Balarāma - Sūtra I.1; urutha.

and Lesser Gods (Khaṇḍa VII + VIII) Contd

Brahma: Matsyama 43.

Viṣṇu - Bāla III.12; Matsyama 43

Śiva = Rudra, Bāla II.12 = Nara Nārāyaṇa I.3; Matsyama 43

Sākkidhana (= Kārttikeya = Subrahmaṇya) Pratijñā II.2; Bāla II.22; Matsya 43

Gaṇeśa: Pratijñā I.1; III (?)

Lakṣmī = [illegible] Kamsa in Bāla II

Umā = [illegible] Pancha II.44 [illegible] Brahm II.2

Kāntiyāyanī (with an extra 'i' appearing before Kamsa in Bāla II 10.

This comparison in parallel columns makes it quite clear that the devatāmandala is almost the same

in both. Some particular gods might not be referred to but that is almost an accident. Perhaps we must make it clear at the very outset that Sri M. Ghosh's reference to Gaṇeśa in Bharata's Nāṭya Śāstra III. 9. following Abhinava Gupta's comment is definitely out of place as I have endeavoured to show in an article in the Mythic Society Journal - New series Vol XLI Nos 3 & 4, Jan and April 1951. Bharata does not at all refer to Gaṇeśa throughout his N.S. This Gaṇeśa, as understood now is a late god who cannot be easily traced back to an earlier date than the 6th Cen. A.D (as Dr Bhandarkar pointed out long ago in his Vaiṣṇavism etc), even Bhāsa referring to the leader of Śiva's gaṇas as Skanda only. To Kālidāsa, again, Skanda is the only son of Pārvatī as is clear from Kumāra I. 14. [illegible] The context [illegible] of [illegible] + [illegible]. The context is clear in describing that the plants alone and not Gaṇeśa are [illegible] to Skanda. Till this time again, Skanda is the only son of Īśvara, and Bāṇa in Harṣa IV. 1. and Amarakośa I. 38 are perhaps the earliest authorities to refer to our Gaṇeśa in the modern sense of the term. In the earlier days,

Upanisads, and the epics, the Ganesa is either Skanda or Siva himself and the modern elephant-headed god is conspicuous by his absence in the earlier Upanisads and the earlier Puranas like Vishnu, Vayu or Markandeya. The Ganapatha Atharvaśirsa Upanisad, one of the 108 published in N.S. Press Bombay, is evidently late. In the Ramayana for example when Visvamitra is following Rama and Lakshmana in Bālakāṇḍa XXII.16, he is described as being followed by कुमारावेव पृष्ठतः, two kumāras and anybody can see that it would be more pertinent if the comparison of two brothers was to the two famous brothers Ganesa and Skanda. One can also recall to his mind the way in which Ganesa being described as the scribe who wrote the Mahābhārata dictation is also recognised as a late interpolation. Similarly the attempt of some commentators to read a reference to the modern Ganesa in Pratimā I.1

पातु गिरिजात्मजः [illegible] ॥

[illegible] ॥

is also quite out of place. Vatarāja is interpreted as a synonym of Kārttikeya since he is a younger brother of the Jyeshthārāja Ganesa. [illegible]

The Elephant Head of Ganapati is a symbolical representation of victory. Hence at the commencement of every undertaking, the orthodox Hindu offers prayers to this God to bless him with success. He is the Lord in chief of the Ganesa or troops of inferior deities. - War in Ancient India - pp 146-148.

to be so called because of Rgveda II. 23.1. - [illegible] ...
[illegible] ... [illegible]. The Vira hymn
as anybody can see, refers only to Brahma and not at
all to Ganapati. Even the term [illegible] in Prajna
III which is interpreted by Dr Ganapati Sastri as
referring to Ganapati is to be correctly understood
as referring to Skanda alone who is also referred
to as [illegible] in Kalidasa's Kumarasambhava
Bhasa's Abhisheka VI - [illegible]
6 and [illegible] 4 do not, as anybody
can see, refer to Ganesa or Ganapati as we understand
him. That is why we have inserted a question mark
against the name of this God both under Bhasa and Bhasa.

The Puranic period slightly later might
emphasise the worship of Siva and Vishnu, but in
Bhavabhuti's or Bhasa's time, Brahma also receives his
due share of worship as one of the most important
gods. The Madhyamaka Vyayoga is 3rd Act starting
with Visvakarma or Brahma is significant in this
connection. The bit 'indram hariharavim' in
Abhis. I. 3. seems to indicate that the Puranic tradition
of Hari and Hara installing Indra as the chief god of

In the Bhāgavata also Buddha is mentioned as an Avatāra of Viṣṇu & the Brahmanda prescribes a festival for the anniversary of Buddha where it is declared that an image of Buddha should be worshipped that day. Even in South India from an inscription of 7th cen we know that Buddha was counted as an avatāra. The Gupta religious revival emphasised this avatāra doctrine. This avatāra doctrine goes back to Pre Buddhistic times. Pāṇini knew and worshipped them, but Patañjali it was who first deified Krishna as an avatāra. This doctrine becomes prominent in the Gītā. We hear of Aṁśāvatāras like Kapila, Dattātreya and Pūrṇāvatāras like Krishna.

Heaven ending in their own exaltation to the exclusion of Brahma had already been conceived in the Puranic poet's brain. Later Brahma actually began to be viewed with disfavour as he granted boons most indiscriminately to Rākṣasas and landed the favourite gods of the Puranic poets in dire peril from which Viṣṇu in most cases or Śiva extricated them. As has been already remarked, Bhāsa refers to Nārāyaṇa or Viṣṇu as Vāmana, Rama, Kṛṣṇa, Nara-simha, and Varāha avatāras and the Daśāvatāra scheme was only fitted up 3 or 4 centuries later. Sri R.C. Hazra in his 'Puranic Customs' puts this matter in a nutshell thus: 'The Matsya Purāṇa 54 includes Buddha among the ten incarnations of Viṣṇu. Markaṇḍeya 4 mentions Avatāras beginning with Varāha and ending with Mathurā Kṛṣṇa but does not mention Buddha. The Harivaṃśa does not mention Buddha but mentions Kalki. Brahma Purāṇa agrees with Markaṇḍeya and Harivaṃśa. The Jayākhya Saṃhitā of about 450 A.D. of the Pāñcharātra school does not refer to the Buddha .... The mention of the Buddha in the Gita Govinda, Daśāvatāracharita of Kṣemendra

a hymn of Nammalwar, and Saint Sadaṣṭpa, Viṣṇu Purana and a Pallava inscription besides Śri Śaṅkara's inclusion shows that this avatāra was admitted in orthodox circles by the 7th cen and probably by 550 A.D." Bhasa himself does not refer to the Matsya, Kūrma and Buddha avatāras and we cannot conclude from his references to Paraśurāma that he might have been glorificous an avatāra of Viṣṇu. It is not clear for us to whom the first 'Nārāyaṇa' in the Bālacharita Nāndi refers. All the same, we have reason to assert that he knew the Puranic theory of incarnation as he declares that Viṣṇu has assumed different shapes in the different yugas and identifies Rama who kills Ravana with Vāmana or Virochana Bali's Killer (Bāla I. 8). The usual wars between the gods and the Rākṣasas are referred to by Nārada in Bāla I. 4. Śri Kṛṣṇa is exalted in the Dūta ghatoe Nāndi as instituting a hundred plans for the protection of the world. He is already the jagatah priyah in Duryodhana's language in verse 35. His possession of shankha is exalted in Duta ghat. 8. and his various āyudhas like Chakra, Śārṅga, Kaumodaki, Śankha and Nandaka and his vehicle Garuḍa are referred to in the Balacharita and in the Dūta Vākya. Kṛṣṇa's Śankha is not as yet glorified

(a) The word पाद्यजन्य occurring in a verse in Dūtavākya is definitely interpolated and spurious,

1 The title प्रतिमा of another drama has strictly nothing to do with the modern pratimā of a temple. Even the word गर्भगृहं in Bālacharita II 4 - कोऽयं विनिष्पतति गर्भगृहं विगाह्य - has nothing to do with the 'sanctum sanctorum' of the temple as we understand at present. It simply means private bed-room of Kamsa as is clear from the context. Evidently these suggest that Bhasa must have lived long before the temple technique was perfected. Even Bāṇa and Bhavabhūti use the word गर्भगृहं in the योगिक sense alone. - Bāṇa describing सूतिकागृहं of चन्द्रापीड says - स्वप्नभ्रमसमुदयोपहृतगर्भगृहं (Kādambarī - I.) प्रदीपप्रभं p 150 - Kādambarī N.S.E. Ed. of 1896 - + Bhavabhūti सूतिकागृहं धर्मासनाद्विशति कामगृहं नरेन्द्रः..

by the name Pāñchajanya as in the Bhagavata where there is a peculiar story that it was fashioned from the bones of a Rākṣasa Pañchajana who had swallowed Sāndipani's son. (X. पूर्वार्ध - 45th chapter). The Sankha as referred to in Bāla I.25 - क्षीरोदधिमथनोद्भवं लक्ष्मीकौस्तुभ - is lifted up from the lactic ocean (a) and has nothing to do with the later Pañchajanya. As Dr R.G. Bhandarkar remarked in his Vaiṣṇavaism (1873) p.3. 'It may be taken for granted that the 2 Vyūhas Vāsudeva and Sankarṣaṇa only were known up to the time of the earliest inscription which is to be referred to about the beginning of the 1st cen before the Christian Era so that the system of the 4 Vyūhas was not fully developed at that time.' Thus the word Pañcharātra as the title of a famous drama of Bhasa has clearly nothing to do with the tenets of the Pañcharātra philosophy which was perfected only in the Jayākhya Saṁhitā of about 450 A.D.[1] Sri M. Ghosh in his article in the Calcutta Dept of Letters already referred to remarks that Bharata is ignorant of the Kṛṣṇa cult and does not refer to him. But this is not correct since the same author in an earlier page quoting the Prākrit slokas of Bharata actually mentions in

verse 22 (quoted in page 18 of the article) that Kṛṣṇa is corrupted into Kanha in Prākṛt, Yaksa into Jakkha etc. (of course, both the K.M and Baroda Edns read 'kṛṣṇam uhvam' instead of kṛṣṇam kahvam, but the 'da' manuscript of Sri M. Ramakrishna Kavi quoted in the footnote in the Baroda Edn clearly reads kṛṣṇam kahvam. But the fact that Kṛṣṇa is not referred to elsewhere presents a knotty problem. Viṣṇu is worshipped as Padmanābha, Nārāyaṇa, Jaladhara, Surottama and his last epithet is shared by Śiva and Hutāśana in III. 27 thus: Viṣṇu is referred to as cleaving and destroying all people, as the source of the three worlds, and the first God of the world in XVI. 76 K.M Edn: विष्णुः सुरोत्तमो देवः संहरते प्रजाः विष्णुस्त्रिलोकस्य देवदेवः ॥ and Padanāma is eulogised in a beautiful alliterative couplet in the same chapter 52 [illegible] ॥ and the nonreference to Kṛṣṇa his younger brother is perhaps to be explained on the supposition that Bhavabhūti was a staunch Śaivite, obviously avoiding all reference if possible to this god who might just then be gaining prominence from the South. The Southerner Bhāsa, slightly late perhaps,

glorified him as 'jagatah prinatah' in the Madhyanga 35
and dedicated his Bāla charita to Him, while the
Northerner Bhavabhūti referred to His other aspects as
they could not be completely blacked out from the list
of the gods to whom an obeisance was necessary
at the beginning of every dramatic occurrence.
If we carefully scan the examples for the various
metres in the chapter on Bhavabhūti for example,
we will find that Siva alone is worshipped and no
mention can be found glorifying Vishnu or His
avatāra Krishna. Brahma and Siva are worshipped
in the Purvaranga ceremony.

Our investigation seems to show that Bhavabhūti
might have preceded Bhāsa by a generation or
two only.

Chapter X Vātsyāyana and Bhāsa

Vātsyāyana seems to have lived chronologically next to Kautilya and Bhāsa and seems to have preceded Aśvaghoṣa and Kālidāsa. If Kautilya's Arthaśāstra logically made artha the starting point of trivarga declaring 'artha eva pradhānaḥ' (I. 7), and explains it as 'artha mūlau hi dharmakāmau', Vātsyāyana, obviously under his influence, starts the 6th chapter of his sixth Adhikaraṇa entitled arthānarthānubandha saṃśaya Vicāra with artha and enumerates the Trivarga as artha, dharma and Kāma (sūtra 5) in a rather peculiar fashion. He agrees closely in subject matter and style with Kautilya; there is even a tradition which regards both as one person since they both belong to the same gotra; Vātsyāyana teaches the method by which material success is gained, whether this success agrees with religion or not, he is not bothered about. Vātsyāyana's reference to Bhāsa's Avimāraka story (p 245, Benares edn) 929) has already been noted and we shall try to show other echoes of Bhāsa in him.

Vātsyāyana's partiality for the prostitute as she could be, from her early age, a connoisseur and a patron also (as Vasantasena of Bhāsa) of the 64 arts detailed by him at the very beginning of his work, is quite understandable; her desire to treat virtue is commended on almost every page; she alone, not the shy house-wife, is capable of giving the greatest satisfaction, [illegible] VI.1.1. because of her having studied all the poses for sexual enjoyment. She might be naturally exempted from any tax or bhoga as Kautilya would insist upon - [illegible] [illegible] (II.27). The latter also insisted that she should (ibid) be privileged to hold the umbrella being a Government servant, wave the chāmara or carry the King's betel-box while the King might be travelling in a palanquin or be seated on his throne - [illegible] [illegible] [illegible], that she should have security of service and be given pension if she became disabled in service and be entitled to special privileges or favours; but

Vātsyāyana advised her on more occasions than one
occasion
to be constant in her devotion, to be पतिव्रता. The
two verses at the end of the 4th adhikaraṇa Vātsyāyana
are significant: सङ्कल्पमनुवर्तेत न भावमस्य हितैषिणी।
कुलयोषा पुनर्वृद्धा वेश्या वोपेक्षिता॥ धर्मार्थौ तस्य
कामं तु भजते स्वाजमेव तु। अस्मिन्पतिं च अन्तरिङ्गाः सङ्कल्पमा-
श्रिताः॥ The list of the virtues of the ideal nāyaka
in the Vaiśikādhikaraṇa [illegible] seems to be more or
less a commentary on Ghaṭakarpara's or Udayana's
(rather any [illegible] Bhāsa's heroes) virtues and the way in
which even a prostitute is advised to concentrate
her affection by being a jitendriyā and not
to run into social or sexual excesses (Cāru III 57
and 58) is a definite echo of Bhāsa's Vasantasenā
who almost voluntarily fits herself into a family
life. In the same strain, Bhāsa showed the way in
which 2 wives of the same person, Vāsavadattā and
Padmāvatī could live amicably under the same
roof, and Vātsyāyana hints that women, if they
would follow his precepts, could keep their husbands in
their control even if the harem contained a 100 ladies
येकाशा राजपुत्री च महामात्रसुतापि च। सङ्कल्पान्तःपुरायाः स्ववशे कुरुते पतिं॥
I-3.22

Pratimā.

A Comparative study of Bharata's Nāṭyaśāstra and Vātsyāyana's Kāmasūtra would lead one to suppose that the latter is of a more elementary character in certain respects and that Bharata effected improvements therein. For example, Kāmasūtra II. 1. 2 mentions only 3 varieties of नायक, शशा, हंस & तीतर three varieties of women मृगी, वडवा & हस्तिनी whereas Bharata XXII. 46. 142 mentions 24 varieties of women. The classification of the heroines in relation to the hero is fuller. Bharata mentions 8 varieties as वासकसज्जिता, विरहोत्कण्ठिता etc. Similarly Bharata attempts a systematic treatment of the arts, particularly music for the first time perhaps, while in Vātsyāyana and the Jātakas, music and dance were already in a developed condition. According to Vātsyāyana, the painting equipment such as the drawing board, brushes etc were in the possession of every cultured citizen or rāgamata implying thereby that every cultured man was an artist by himself. (Sūtras 5-13 pp 43-51).

knows, while the humour of the Mrcch is very often over-drawn, even to the point of presumptuousness. The Comparison of the Vrutkanga boy Dhrijaya by the side of his dying father with the boy Rohasena in the Mrcchakatika act will be very instructive in the Contrast.

See the other Exp. note Book for Continuation.

this new aspect, the objections raised by Devadhar will be satisfactorily met and the correct appraisal of the relationship between the two versions will be possible. It is easier to think that the political background and the lawsuit were added into the Mrccha-Katika rather than the other way round and the later bigger drama - it need not have been very much later, as a matter of fact, it might have been later by only a few days or months - was evolved by making a few additions or improvements and, what is more important, a few omissions also. If there are many places where the emendations in the Charudatta are unnatural and rather flat when compared with the corresponding places in the Mrccha-Katika, the explanation is obvious that the later drama has improved upon them; even the improvement on the theme as noted by Devadhar is better explained in this way rather than as Devadhar is disposed to explain the chronology. Devadhar also notes on p 1117 in his commentary in English: Again in place of the very lengthy description of Vasantasena's mansion which we have in the Mrccha, the Charudatta gives but one brief passage of 4 lines. Brevity is the soul of wit, the earlier Charudatta

तथा विभवमन्दोऽपि जन्मभूमिव्यपेक्षया।

मृद्वं विक्रयकालेऽपि नीलस्तोकेन रञ्जितम् ॥ III.12

This word is not found in the Mrcchakatika obviously because the word नीलस्तोक the explanation for which out of the way word had to be found in the not usually popular Yādava kośa, the common Amarakośa having nothing to speak about it. Similarly the phrase तदेतत् करस्तोकृतसङ्ख्यः इव शाक्य श्रमणकः seems to have been unintelligible to the author of the Mrcchakatika and he seems to have conveniently dropped the same. Similarly Devadhar mentions in his notes many sentences like [illegible] as being not found in the Mrcchakatika. So far, the critics seem to have concentrated only on the 'additions' as they termed them to the ideas as found from Mrcchakatika, and do not seem to have taken stock of the significant omissions therefrom and there are many as Devadhar himself has noted - the better explanation is that these omissions were effected because these were not fully intelligible to the author of the Mrcchakatika. I have only referred to 2 or 3 such instances by way of an illustrative analysis only by the [illegible] and I believe that if due emphasis is laid on

let her enjoy a luxury which adverse circumstances have denied for her heart's dearest. If after Verse 51 in the Act in the Mṛcchakaṭika, the Śakāra threatens while going - अधिकरणे अवहरं विणो न हु णिग्गमो अत्थि, and this reference to the courtscene being purposely omitted, the answer is obvious; the Śakāra simply threatens दारुणः रोषो भविष्यति and there is no reason why a reference to an impending lawsuit is to be read in the context. Similarly if the chetā of the Mṛcchakaṭika is absent in the Charudatta, one need not necessarily jump to the conclusion that he should have been omitted. Charudatta simple, straightforward and suggestively brief in its style, had no necessity at all for this cumbersome and superfluous appendage. Another significant 'omission' it is alleged is the complete absence of the political background. A discriminate reading of the Charudatta can make anybody realise that it is complete as far as it goes. The critics that contend that the Charudatta is abridged seem to imagine that some of the inexplicable points in the Mṛcchakaṭika are purposely omitted in the Charudatta, but I would draw the attention of scholars to some slokas found in the Charudatta but omitted from the bigger work. One such is the curious sloka

to be introduced - proves yatām indrāya. What the commentator here also would have to be brushed aside as unmeaning and ungrammatical. Continuing in the same strain, the Samvāhaka or the championer in it not finding the prostitute, sympathetic and obliging enough even to the extent of paying off his debt to the master of the gaming table, almost applies to her for a job; if now the ganikā cleverly avoids him by saying that he must serve a master as noble as the one he has previously, or if later she again remarks in bidding him farewell, may you go now to come back once again, this punarāgamana or a reference to Cārudatta's future prosperity is taken as tacitly implying that the author of the smaller drama had a definite knowledge of the bigger one. Merely however that the usual idiom in Sanskrit in cases of a farewell is that there must be a sincere prayer along with the same for a reunion, exactly as in the trenchant expression 'au revoir'. If the prostitute says 'serve an equally virtuous man', it should not, again, imply that the author of the smaller drama should have known the existence of the other. The prostitute might send up a sincere prayer, again, that her lover might soon regain his wealth and she might also be unwilling to

the Mṛcchakaṭika and hence has avoided references to the political revolution, to Rohasena, and to the lawsuit which is contemplated by the vengeful 'Śakāra' - these are the words of Devadhar from his introduction to the Cārudatta. Since the reference to Rohasena is omitted towards the end of the very first act where the hero, mistaking Vasantasenā to be his maid, asks her to take the child in to protect it from the cold and hence alone the causal [illegible] is appropriate in the Mṛcchakaṭika and not in the Cārudatta where it becomes meaningless and ungrammatical, we answer that Bhāsa uses in many places this causal form naturally in a noncausal sense and so it must have been more or less a matter of common usage alone in these days. For example in the IV act of the Pratimā, soon after Verse 12, where Rama realises that his brother ~~Lakṣmaṇa~~ Bharata has turned up, orders Lakṣmaṇa Kathayasvaśighraṃ praveśayatām Kumārah; this is to be translated as 'greet the prince and show him in at once'. Even Devadhar himself translates the sentence 'you had better enter the inner room'. Such usages are quite common in the nature of the language. Bāṇa in his Kādambarī asks that the Indrāyudha is

sent a pearl necklace to make up for the loss of the same. The prostitute who has known the truth by a lucky chance thinks that the hero might misunderstand if the pearl necklace is refused and quickly accepts it and decides upon paying a visit by herself to Cārudatta soon after. She admires him for his nobility all the more and her love turns into worshipful passion; after the kidnapper goes away, the other maid Madanikā introduces her lover into the prostitute's presence. The latter pretends as though he is a messenger from Cārudatta but he is cleverly unmasked by the prostitute. In her nobility, the prostitute presents the jewel to Madanikā, presents her to her lover and they both repair to their new home in the prostitute's coach, again another present for the new bridal pair. Vasantasenā herself departs in another chariot in spite of the fact that it strongly resembles to Cārudatta's house with the pearl necklace and we are left to guess the final outcome - another happy bridal couple!

Now let us try to meet a few of the arguments of those who believe that Cārudatta was abridged from the Mṛcchakaṭika by removing the political episode and also the lawsuit. The author of the Cārudatta wanted to make a pleasing comedy out of the first four acts of

prostitute has been looking at him from her parlour upstairs and the thief somehow manages to attract the maid's attention. The latter suspects something fishy about her sweetheart's transaction and manages to extract a confession from his lips that the jewels were stolen from a rich merchant's house in the richest Sreshti's quarters. The talk is being overheard by the prostitute slyly from her parlour; exactly at the moment, flashes in the mind, of both the prostitute and the maid, the idea whether anybody might have been injured in the process of the theft and the maid's next question and the thief's reply are fortunately for the prostitute sufficiently reassuring. The maid now makes the thief realise that the ornaments stolen were Vasantasena's and were deposited there for safe custody by herself. The thief is therefore advised to return the jewels which of course he finds it impossible to act upon. The maid then advises him to pretend that the jewels were sent back by Charudatta because of the insecurity of the house and he agrees to do so. In the meanwhile, the Vidushaka is introduced; he wants to know the cost of the jewels deposited and when asked why he wants the information, explains that the jewels have been gambled away by Charudatta who has now

Brahmani, the senior wife of the Charudatta has heard about the loss of these jewels, and also about the terrible effect upon her husband's mind. She now pretends she has been fasting the previous day and that day when she wants to break the fast, she wants to present her personal pearl necklace, a very costly heirloom which she has received as present from her father (and which Charudatta dare not touch in spite of his present impoverished condition) to the Vidūṣaka. The latter understands the implication of the 'gift' and reports about the same to the hero who promptly asks him to offer up the same to the prostitute in lieu of her jewels which he pretends he had gambled and lost. With this end the act.

The next act (the last) finds us in the prostitute's drawing room. The latter has herself drawn a lively portrait of the hero presenting his scented upper cloth to the warhout for his having rescued the recluse and walking back bareboiled to his house. News is just then brought that the Śākāra has just then sent some rich presents and his Paushkara or lotus couch. The prostitute angrily rejects the ornaments. In the meanwhile, Sarvilaka the thief has brought the box of stolen jewels to that place and with a suspicious air about him, slyly calls the maid. By chance, the

return late at midnight after attending some music performance and the maid in the house who was responsible for the safety of the jewels the two previous nights, now hands them over to the terribly sleepy Vidusaka for safe custody. Finding that he will not be able to sleep confidently with the box of jewels, the latter rather reluctantly accepts the box silently praying that the same be stolen away to rid him of all future bother. Soon after both of them fall asleep and the thief cleverly bores a hole in the wall and enters. He has a shock when he finds the Vidusaka talking in his sleep offering the box of jewels to his friend for safer custody. The thief reassures himself that the person is only talking in his dreams, accepts the box, and walks quietly out as the cock crows in the early dawn. The Vidusaka who is fast asleep is now roused up by the maid who has got up for her morning work and finds that a hole is made in the wall. The realisation of the loss of the prostitute's jewels dawns on them soon after and this is too much for the hero as the public comment will be that Chandatta must have misappropriated the jewels and to cover up the same pretended now that they were stolen away. In the meanwhile, the

has to go out when the mahout servant of Vasantasena rushes him and describes the gallant way in which he rescued a rechsi from the clutches of their infuriated elephant. For this act of his, he was rewarded by a noblelooking spectator with his own scented upper cloth (evidently the same as at the end of Act I) as he had nothing else to spare. The prostitute is only too glad to see the person who was now slowly wending his way home after being divested of his upper cloth and takes the same from her servant only to hug it to her bosom passionately. As if these testimonials are not enough to drown the prostitute in her sea of passion, the dramatist in the next act makes these jewels of the prostitute deposited in Charudattas house stolen away. Though the jewels are thus lost, the virtue of Charudatta makes him declare that they are lost in gambling. By a piece of good luck, the jewels have been stolen by the lover of Vasantasena's own maid, the lover wanting to find the money for ransoming the maid by stealing from the noblelooking house in the richest merchants' quarter, least suspecting that Charudatta was now completely impoverished as he was himself a stranger to the city. The Vidushaka and Charudatta

guided by Bhasa's depiction of the Vesyā, how the latter tried to accommodate herself into her new home under Cārudatta's roof amicably with a senior wife.

The second act is but the dovetailing together of the various unsolicited testimonials as it were that are offered to Cārudatta and cleverly heard by the prostitute in her own drawing room. Her maid cleverly draws out from her a confession of her sincere affection for the hero (and disgust for Sākāra). At this moment, an ex-employee of Cārudatta, a Samvāhaka or shampooer, now thrown out of employment and fallen into gambling and other vices, is pursued by another gambler to whom he has lost 10 golden pieces. By chance the gambler runs into the prostitute's house and gets a sympathetic hearing particularly because the latter understands that he was serving Cārudatta. The prostitute is overjoyed at the excellent account of her lover from the gambler's lips and readily parts with a golden bangle. The pursuer receives the same and slips away fully satisfied. The grateful gambler applies for a job in her house, but the clever prostitute suggests that such an excellent art must find an equally excellent connoisseur as he was fortunate enough to serve so far. The miserable fellow

his jewels and so should be restored to him the next day. Both the Śakāra and his friend beat a hasty retreat now. In the meanwhile, Vasantasenā, who had slipped into the house, was mistaken for his maid by Cārudatta and asked by him to get him his scented upper cloth. The prostitute eagerly took it up and remains silent, her love for him increasing by the realisation of the fact that the man even in his poverty had not abjured his old luxurious habits. Her silence made the hero rather perplexed, but the entry of the Brahmin friend Maitreya and Radanikā at this stage after the pūjā explains the mystery and Cārudatta has a pleasant shock when he realises that the lady who seeks his protection was the prostitute Vasantasena. The way in which Bhasa has arranged the scene in the first part of the night reminds us of an exactly similar and excellently arranged scene in the fifth act of the Svapnavāsavadatta. The first act ends with the prostitute cleverly creating another opportunity for her to come once again by entrusting her jewels - for the sake of which, she alleges, sinful people like Śakāra pursue her - into the safe custody of Cārudatta. One is even tempted to imagine that Vātsyāyana while writing his Kāmasūtras must have been

helpless prostitute sternly repulsed him regardless of the consequences. The ambiguity of the Prakrit language in having the same word for Śānta = shut up and Śrānta = tired was availed of by the Śakāra and bullied by two unscrupulous fellows, the Śakāra and his servant Viṭa, the prostitute was extremely miserable when a chance utterance of the Śakāra that Cārudatta's house was nearby, afforded her the needed protection and she managed to slip into her sweetheart's house the door of which was just then fortunately opened by Cārudatta's Brahmin friend Maitreya and Radanikā. The latter, the maidservant of the house, was holding a lamp in her hand for the former to come out and offer the daily worship at the street corner. The wily prostitute blew out the lamp in the maid's hand and quietly slipped in unobserved, while the Brahmin friend walked again to light the lamp. The maid, unsuspicious of danger, walked out to be seized upon by the Śakāra and roughly handled. By this time, the Brahmin walked out with the lamp, and he became incensed at the outrage suffered by the maid. Though inwardly quaking with fear, the Śakāra pretended that the prostitute had slipped into Cārudatta's house with

A magnanimous merchant prince, but now impov-
-erished (- not because of his race-going or other
luxurious habits -) was the noble Brahmin Cāruḍatta
who lived in the richest quarters of Ujjain. His
virtues had already attracted the admiration of
the richest prostitute in the city by name Vasanta-
-sena (who was not a prostitute by character).
She was only waiting for a suitable opportunity
of expressing her love and she does so now, though
in rather dramatic circumstances. The brotherinlaw
of the then ruling King, an eccentric coxcomb, whose
only pretension for Vasantasena's love was his
riches, his 'malaprop-isms' and his supposed
influence with the ruling King (this last is exploited
fully in the later Mṛcchakatikā trial scene) had
already made offers to her, but she had summarily
refused even to see him. Naturally he felt highly
offended and one day, when by chance, he found
the highly cultured lady walking alone in the street,
the Śakāra, for that was the name of this coxcomb
promiscuously mispronouncing śa, ṣa and sa as śa,
emboldened by his assistant's presence, waylaid
the woman under cover of the evening dusk. The

Busy King as the latter was, he must have found Bhasa's drama very handy. The latter must have enlarged upon the gambling scene, the theft, and the description of Vasantasena's palatial mansion and purposely pulled out the Śakāra to his full heights as a rival or a foil to the love romance of Cārudatta and Vasantasenā. The absence of the Nāndi and the Bharatavākya, Sutradhāra speaking Prākṛit and the abrupt end of the drama are unique in the smaller drama. If the Sutradhāra speaks Prākṛit here, one could easily compare it with the Brahmin Indra in disguise in the Karṇabhara also speaking Prākṛit and the irresistible conclusion is that Bhāsa must have lived before the dramaturgic rule about the Brahmin's necessarily speaking Sanskrit became definitely codified. Some have argued that this might have been Bhasa's last drama abruptly terminated by his death; but it seems more probable that in his eagerness to write his more famous dramas, the Ratnā and the two famous Udayana dramas, and more particularly out of deference to his patron Śūrajamitra (= Śūdraka) whom he supervised when he wrote the Mṛcchakatika, he left his drama more or less in an imperfect fashion.

Chārudatta.

This seems to be the same as the Daridracharudatta quoted by Abhinavagupta, the famous Commentator of Bharata's Nāṭyaśāstra. Though it is an ordinary society story not connected with any aristocratic King, it has captured the imagination of the people for nearly 2000 years now since it is the love romance of an impoverished and extremely virtuous hero. The heroine herself goes out to woo her love and the story consequently is unique in world's love episodes and deserves to be preeminently regarded as the precursor of the famous Mṛcchakaṭika. A long controversy has ranged about the question whether the Chārudatta is the original for the first four acts of the Mṛcchakaṭika or vice versa but considering the fact that in the former there are only 55 verses to the 143 verses of the corresponding 4 acts of the latter drama, where also the style is very prose as contrasted with the crisp and suggestive style of Bhāsa, an unbiased mind is tempted to conclude in favour of Śūdraka, the latter (and also later) dramatist having added a political byplot to the already existing nice drama.

peculiarity of this drama is that there is no woman brought on the stage, the only woman character being Bṛhannaḍā who is really Arjuna in that guise. We may definitely assert that Viśākhadatta's Mudrārākṣasa followed faithfully in the wake of this excellent and brief drama; there also no woman is brought on the stage; if there was any talk of the family of the ex-Prime Minister Rākṣasa, it was for the purpose of being sacrificed at the altar of Cāṇakya's wrath.

The name Pañcharātra itself is interesting: evidently Bhāsa must be referred to a time long before the system of the four Vyūhas, Saṅkarṣaṇa, Aniruddha, Pradyumna and Vāsudeva was evolved, even dreamt of in the religious cults of our land. Dr Bhandarkar in his Vaiṣṇavaism, Saivismetc p. 3. refers the two earlier Vyūhas Vāsudeva and Saṅkarṣaṇa to the time of the earliest inscription, i.e. about the beginning of the first century B.C., but we may definitely assert that even these two earlier Vyūhas do not seem to have any reference to them anywhere in the dramas of Bhāsa. The names Saṅkarṣaṇa and Vāsudeva might be used in the Balacharita with reference to the two brothers, but obviously have nothing to do with the Vyūha and the Antaryāmi (or internally regulating) doctrine of the Pañcharātra philosophy. The other important Pāśupata doctrine in this philosophy is also completely absent in Bhāsa.

Sakuni, the cunning Advocate, asserts that there may be some other namesake of Arjuna. Duryodhana is naturally reminded of his Gurudaksinā and once again expresses his readiness to offer the Pandavas their share of the patrimony if their identity is established now. What a contrast to the Bharata epic Duryodhana who refused them even so much land as could be pierced by a sharp needle point even!

At this juncture, a messenger is announced from the Virata kingdom, and after due formalities, Uttara enters. When questioned about his credentials, he states he has been sent, not by the Virāṭa King his father, but by Pandava Yudhisthira. He has been deputed to know where the marriage of Uttarā is to be celebrated, either in Virata nagara or in Hastināpura. Sakuni vociferously says 'let it be celebrated there alone!' Drona now quietly demands his Gurudaksinā on behalf of the Pandavas and willingly Duryodhana parts with their share of the Kingdom for the Pandavas. Kurukulakṣema is secured, and war is avoided.

The rasa or the main sentiment is Vira or heroism. The three types - Dharmavira in Duryodhana, dayavira in Drona, Yuddhavira in all the heroes arrayed against each other - are described and most of the heroes are semi-divine in their origin (as required by rules of dramaturgy for the peculiar type Samavakāra). The

Balarama or Krishna, or that his being Arjuna's son could always guarantee him his life, was of no avail and the noble Duryodhana is cursing himself that he should have been privy to the loss of his innocent nephew. Drona calls for more particulars about the capture of the boy and from the description of the 'foot soldier' provided by the charioteer, Bhisma and Drona conclude that the captor who embraced the boy and swooped upon Abhimanyu's car must have been Bhima himself. Sakuni ridicules the idea saying that these old persons in their partiality for the Pandavas see them in each and every exploit, but even he is forced to confess that just as Abhimanyu was overpowered on the one side by some mighty personality, they who had been fighting apart, were routed by another mighty personality and that according to some was Sattara and according to others was Arjuna. Even here the two old warring desirous of the welfare of both the Kauravas and Pandavas, insist on calling the latter Arjuna, and assert that Sattara could never be supposed to have held the entire Kaurava army at bay, but Sakuni continues to prevaricate. Another charioteer enters at this context to provide them with an arrow of the latter mighty personality whose arrow had pierced them all and the name thereon is clearly Arjuna's

flow is completely absent in Bhasa's Version. To continue our story, Virata wants to know where the marriage is to be celebrated, either in his own city or in Hastināpura and in consultation with Yudhisthira. Uttara the prince goes out as envoy from the latter to the Kauravas to settle this matter and invite them for the same.

In the meanwhile (Act III) the discomfited Kauravas have, with some difficulty, managed to return safe to their capital. Having returned however, they take stock of the situation and find that Abhimanyu is missing. When they were keen on **returning** back for the very safety of their lives, they were not enthusiastic about others, but once Duryodhana has reached his capital and finds Abhimanyu absent his old natural affection for this boy rushes back and he remarks with sincere affection (the epic Duryodhana would never have felt so) "My quarrel is only with the parents of that boy, never with him; the young boys are innocent, more particularly in this case, the boy came and fought on our side as against our enemies. Shame on us that we allowed our enemies to capture him prisoner. Any amount of persuasion by the wily Sakuni that the boy would be easily released by his maternal uncles

the so-called Victor, Uttara, feeling extremely embarrassed about the congratulations that are being poured upon him, enters. The King asks him whether the heroes of the day have been duly honoured (according to the rules of international politics as e.g. in Kautilya). Uttara replies that he has already noted the names of the smaller warriors and honoured them while reserving the highest honour to be awarded by his own father to the bravest warrior. On being asked to name him, he refers to Arjuna who was standing before them as Bṛhannalā now. Dressed as a woman, Arjuna hesitates in the beginning, but as he is cornered, he has to reveal himself and incidentally explains that the so-called Brahmin is Yudhisthira and the dissembling cook is Bhima. Virata and others receive agreeable surprises and Abhimanyu is particularly happy that he has been captured after all by his own uncle. The grateful Virata offers his daughter Uttarā to Arjuna in appreciation of his having saved their national honour, but Arjuna accepts her as a daughterinlaw on behalf of his son Abhimanyu. It should be noted here that the offensive scene in which the Virata King strikes the dissembling Brahmin Yudhisthira with the dice coin causing blood to

of the Kauravas. The old king naturally inferred that his son was the victor, and wants to congratulate him in open assembly. The 'Brahmin' (really Yudhisthira in disguise) and the King are in the assembly talking together when Abhimanyu is ushered in. The boy in his haughtiness refuses to prostrate himself before the old King, but proudly bows to a 'Brahmin' by the side. The 'Brahmin' affectionately blesses him; the King wants to know the details of the boy's arrest. Bhima in his disguise says he has arrested him and the boy pertinently reminds him to add the word 'without any weapons'. Bhima retorts that his arms alone are his weapons; the boy feels openly that these words fit in only into the mouth of his 'madhyama' paternal uncle. The 'Brahmin' does not know who such a 'madhyama' might be, but the boy respecting a Brahmin does not want to be discourteous to him. The Virata King himself repeats the question and the answer is elicited that the 'madhyama' was the killer of Jarāsandha whom even Śrī Kṛṣṇa dared not kill. The boy further asserts that his own uncle would release him from the present ignominious capture. At this juncture

manage to beat a hasty retreat and escape with their lives. The 'prisoner' is chafing over his defeat by an 'unarmed warrior' and on the way the 'so-called Cook' enquires, calling him by his name in the singular, about the welfare of Devakiputra and Subhadrā. (Such a reference in the singular in our spoken languages both in the South and in the North is deemed contemptuous except when an elder in the family addresses his junior affectionately). Outraged at the impudent behaviour of an ordinary footsoldier, Abhimanyu smarts under his disgrace keenly, when the 'woman' Bṛhannalā enters and adds to his discomfiture by also talking to him in a similar outrageous fashion. Abhimanyu feels terribly insulted feeling as though they mock at him. Bṛhannalā, just to tickle him further, asks him how he allowed himself to be captured though he was Arjuna's Son; he confesses that he was dumbfounded at the way in which he was overpowered, but all the same he definitely asserted that the dead persons were really pierced by his own arrows. In the meanwhile, of course, information had already been carried to the Old King about the successful repulse

the following five nights.

The war actually starts, we may say, on two fronts. On one side, the cattle are lifted by the Kauravas. News is brought to the old King who is busy with janmanakṣatra śānti to propitiate the stars of his nativity; in the meanwhile, Uttara, the timid son has started, fortunately under Bṛhannalā's escort. Bṛhannalā is really Arjuna under a curse of impotency for a year and he first proceeds to the cemetery where in a Śamī tree, the Pandavas have deposited their weapons. He takes out the Gāṇḍiva bow, and defeats all the Kauravas arrayed against them and the cows are brought back safely. Just a little further off, the representative of Śrī Kṛṣṇa for the sacrifice of Duryodhana, Abhimanyu fights his own uncles, not knowing who they are. He has come along with the Kauravas and naturally finds himself confronting Bhima, the 'cook' who has thrown himself into the battlefield there. Bhima quietly recognises his own nephew, walks up to him, and before the other Kaurava senior warriors are able even to realise what may be up his sleeve, he captures Abhimanyu in his mighty cagelike arms and walks away with his prisoner. The Kauravas hosts

person referred to and suggests in an aside to Drona to press for his Gurudakṣiṇā. In the meanwhile, the wily advocate-general is ready with a backdoor method and suggested to Duryodhana that he could offer their share of the kingdom to the Pandavas if their identity could be revealed within five nights, least suspecting that they would announce themselves within that short period. The title Pancharātra refers to this stipulated period of five nights and almost every one in the assembly, even Drona and others feel that Duryodhana was only trying to frustrate a dakṣiṇā which he had vainglariously promised. Bhiṣma, on the other hand, urges Drona to accept even this halfhearted dakṣiṇā, lest he might even back out of it and suggests a plan to make the Pandavas come out of their hiding (without saying this openly) by insisting that Virāṭa's cattle should be lifted or stolen inasmuch as he had dared insult them by not responding to their invitation for the yajña. Accordingly the Kurujyeṣṭhas or the big guns in the Kaurava army prepare to start on their military expedition against Virāṭa and Duryodhana has once again clearly avowed his eagerness to share his kingdom with the Pandavas if they announced their identity within

nations and looks up to his advisers, his uncle Śakuni and his bosom friend Karṇa for an escape by a back door from the trap into which he has unconsciously walked in. The straightforward Karṇa tells him: 'If you want to maintain brotherly relations with your cousins, I do not stand in your way; we are by your side only when you wish to fight them tooth and nail'. But Duryodhana looks now to Śakuni, his wily advocate-general. The latter suggests that some sandy unfertile plot of land being assigned to the Pandavas as their share of the patrimony. Even this advice is not palatable to Duryodhana who avers that Yudhisthira's kingship even in a saline plot of land will surely convert the same into a most fertile plot. All the same, Duryodhana is determined to keep up his plighted word with his preceptor. Then they are thus hesitating, the Virata King's ambassador walks in and explains his master's absence not as being necessitated by the internal dissensions caused by the murder of the 100 Kichakas by some mysterious person with no weapons but his own hands. Bhishma at once reads between the lines and infers that Bhima must be the mysterious

1 Duryodhana all along suspected Bhisma (and Drona) of partiality for the Pandavas. Earlier on the third day of the battle, Duryodhana said. Bhisma Parva 54th adhyaya 35-

अनुग्राह्याः पाण्डुसुता नूनं तव पितामह (could we not say here गुरुत्तम also)

यथेमां क्षमसे वीर वध्यमानां वरूथिनीम् ॥

यदि नाहं परित्याज्यो युद्धाभ्यामिह संयुगे

विक्रमेणानुरूपेण युध्येतां पुरुषर्षभौ ॥

Bhisma in reply has to confess that the Pandavas were invincible but all the same he would certainly put forth his best:

यत्तु शक्यं मया कर्तुं दृष्टेनाद्य नृपोत्तम

करिष्यामि यथाशक्ति प्रेक्षेदानीं सबान्धवः ॥

paramount sovereign. Sri Krishna had sent Abhimanyu as his representative but the Virāṭa King, as he explains, could not send anybody because of the internal disorders consequent on the murder of Kīchaka and his 100 brothers.

The sacrifice itself was a novel idea of Duryodhana who definitely knew that Drona's sincere affection was definitely for the Pandavas and more particularly for Arjuna, his most favourite disciple. So Duryodhana conceives of a yajna wherein at the end he offered to grant to Drona his preceptor in both Dharma and dhanus, any dakṣiṇā or gift the latter might choose to demand. When thus asked in the open assembly, Drona is taken completely by surprise and his first impulse is not to trust Duryodhana's sincerity of purpose. Duryodhana is naturally taken aback by Drona's distrust and readily repeats the offer thrice at the latter's suggestion. The unsuspecting Duryodhana has the shock of his life when Drona coolly asks for a gift of their patrimony to the Pandavas. This Duryodhana (unlike his counterpart in the Dūtavākya resisting any suggestion of the legality of the birth of the Pandavas) is torn between his duty towards his Guru and his own personal inti

Madhva in his Bṛhadāraṇyaka bhāṣya remarks:

सर्वोपनिषदश्चैव पञ्चरात्रारण्यसंहिताः ब्रह्मसूत्राणि
वेदानां व्याख्यासारां च विस्तरः सर्वमेतज्जगाद्यैव
निस्सृतं हरिमानतः ।

Among the Udayana dramas, Svapnavāsavadatta is the best; Pratimā is the superior among the Rāma dramas, and Pancharātra best reflects his dramatic skill among the Bhārata dramas. This is a three-act Samavakāra, a rare dramatype noticed by Bharata in his Nāṭyaśāstra but since forgotten. The Uttara-gograhana or the lifting of the cattle from Virāṭa's cowpen and their rescue by Uttara the crown prince (really by Arjuna his charioteer) is the subject matter exactly as borrowed from the original, but Bhasa's ingenuity has made the story entirely new and novel. In the original, the cattle lifting is without any purpose at all, while here the episode comes in as a counterblast to the Virāṭa king's not attending Duryodhana's sacrifice and insulting him thereby. This Duryodhana's sacrifice is not at all performed in the original and Bhasa wants us to understand that all kings invited for the function had to attend either in person or by proxy, non-attendance being interpreted in international circles as an insult to the

The original in the Sabhāparva द्यूतपर्व context where Bhima vows makes Bhima vow that he would smash only the सक्थि or left thigh which he laid bare inviting Draupadi to sit thereon. It must have been Bhāsa who for the first time referred to both the thighs being समसक्थिद्वयेनाथ सुतः पाण्डोर्भविष्यति smashed by Bhima's gadā; this must have been later made more popular by Bhatta Nārāyana in the Veni Samhāra. Even Maitreya's curse in the Vanaparva is सक्थिनी भेत्स्यति in the singular number.

Aśvatthāman is forced to complain that Bhima should have broken Duryodhana's māna or selfrespect along with his thighs and his vow is overheard by both Dhṛtarāṣṭra and Balarāma who go only after Duryodhana's body has been carried away in a celestial plane. Earlier, again the contemptuous kicking of Duryodhana's crowned head by the violent Bhima is purposely avoided; Kṛṣṇa puts on his own thigh to give Bhima the hint to break Duryodhana's thigh, while in the original, it is Arjuna that strikes his left thigh in the gaze of Bhima (Gadāyuddha Parva chap LIX. 20). In the first scene, three soldiers describe the club fight or the Gadāyuddha of Bhima and Duryodhana and emphasise the hitting 'below the belt' by Bhima; in the second Balarama is dissuaded by Duryodhana from wreaking his revenge on the Pandavas; later he (Balarama) stands aside overhearing the conversation between the fallen Duryodhana and his wives, parents and his son Durjaya; the last scene shows us Aśvatthāman entering and proposing to slay Kṛṣṇa and Arjuna, but even here Duryodhana though dying refuses to countenance any such counter move and dies.

Abhinavagupta seems to know this drama as Gadāyuddha.

तस्याङ्गुलतदेहस्य पादयोर्निपतिष्यतः।
युधिष्ठिरस्य नृपतेर्धर्मस्य दीर्घदर्शिनी॥
अङ्गुल्यग्रेण ददृशे देवी पद्मानलेन सा
ततः स कुनखीभूतो दर्शनीयनखो नृपः॥

mighty embrace. With respect to Gandhari also, she tried
by looking through the blindfolding bandage across her
eyes at Yudhisthira's feet and caught a glimpse of the
white nails on the toe and other leg fingers and all these
nails were blackened, the darśaniya or lovely nails became
kunakhas or ugly (vide slokas 5..7 of Strī Parva XV). But
Vyāsa has brought the parents direct into the battlefield and
made the scene as pathetic as possible. Even Bhavabhūti's
pathos so famous in Sanskrit literature, cannot we
dare say, approach this memorable scene of Duryo-
dhana's death on the stage in its sublime simplicity.
Duryodhana in the original is eager to have some reta-
liation on the Pandavas and even definitely encourages
Aśvatthāman in his nefarious adventure, but here he
even humbly requests the Halāyudha or Balarāma not
to drive his mighty plough against the Pandavas. He
wants them to survive so that they might perform
the tarpaṇa or water libations for him after his
death, - the very Duryodhana who had publicly
denounced the Pandavas as Kṣetrajas and illegal
sons not entitled to any patrimony in Dūta Vākya.
Balarama in the original walks away in protest,
but here he stays on right till the very end.

are listed in a progressive order[12] from birth to the present moment. His mother's disclosure to him has taken the wind out of his sails and after that there are a series of discomfitures, all dramatically narrated by Karna himself. Our hearts cry out in sympathy, "Oh! he deserved a better fate!" and we appreciate the title 'Better' as Karna's discomfitures. Karna is of course trying to do his very best for the salt of his master Duryodhana; he wants to capture Yudhishthira alive and defeat Arjuna, but the darling of misfortune is dogged by ill-omens and mental nightmares almost at every step!

Urubhanga or Gadāyuddha.

In the original, the parents of Duryodhana do not see him alive after his thighs are broken on the battle-field. They come to see the dead bodies only long after. Vidura, Vedavyāsa and others have in the meanwhile discoursed to them on the inevitability and inexorability of fate, but the pent-up feelings of hatred could not be easily suppressed and Dhṛtarāṣṭra's inner ideas are so easily palpable that Sri Kṛṣṇa cleverly pushes Bhima away and substitutes his iron statue for the latter to embrace. Even that statue is crushed under the old King's

Just as Duryodhana's seniority in the "senior line entails so many worries, Karna's mind is weighted down with worries driving away his peace of mind particularly before he starts for his last battle with Arjuna. The presentation of this Vimalā Śakti by Indra to Karṇa actually occurs in the original in the Vana Parva 311th Adhyaya, long, long, before the actual commencement of the fratricidal war, but Bhasa purposely shifts it to the present context where it can be easily utilised dramatically. According to the original, again, Sūrya, the father, has come and warned his son Karṇa not to part with the celestial Kavachas if Indra were to beg for these, but here that part of the story is purposely withheld from us. Even the bargaining as found in the original - the way in which Karna says he would part with his Kavacha if only Indra would make a present of a mighty Śakti to him, is not to be met with here at all. Śalya, the royal charioteer, is positively inimical and jeers him at every step in pursuance of his promise to his nephews, the twin sons of Mādrī; but according to Bhāsa, he is very sympathetic and even listens patiently to the old episodes, ending with so many discomfitures for Karna. He even tries to dissuade him from gifting away the Kavachas - the last and the most painful, drowning discomfiture. The discomfitures are

before Bhima. But Bhasa cleverly made Duryodhana himself elder even to Yudhisthira and with one stroke of his pen, cleverly banished all such worry from Dhrtarastra's mind. To Bhasa, therefore, Duryodhana is the jyestha among the hundred and five brothers and the jyestha's mind was consequently worried over the problem of the protection of the dependent members of the family over and above his royal worries for the welfare of his subjects. If the Pandavas chose to deny themselves the brotherly protection which Duryodhana was ever eager to provide for them, he was not at all to blame. This is hinted at by Bhisma in Pancharatra I.37 when he plaintively appealed to Duryodhana as the jyestha who should afford shelter and protection to the brothers who were now languishing in the forest along with the deer. The blind old king calls his son after his thigh is broken on the battlefield the legal master of eighteen Aksauhinis. This number definitely suggests that the seven Aksauhinis of the Pandava army also were technically to be regarded as his as he is the jyestha. Duryodhana's primogeniture, in one word entitles him to the entire patrimony. Now to the title Jarnalhara,

1 The Karṇabhāra नान्दी

नरसिंह गपति वर्षा लोक नभानानदी-
नरदनुजस्तुपर्व कातपाताल लोक:
करजकुलिशपालीभिन्न दैत्येन्द्र वक्षः
सुरपति कुवलहन्ता श्रीधरोऽस्तु श्रियेव ॥

is noteworthy in having alliteration of र in the second letter in each line. This regular प्रास is a feature of the Dravidian languages, more particularly in Kannada and Tamil. In Tamil this is called एदुकै and is a necessary element in prosody.

stories in English or French literature, presenting a dramatic translation of a single mood, and at the same time dramatic lyrics in prose and verse mixed together!

Karnabhara!

The title has taxed the brain of many an ingenious critic; some have translated it as (mental) worry, yet others as a heavy deadweight; we propose to combine all these ideas and compare the use of the word with the ancient Buddhist Jātaka (vol. V. p 326) where we find the following sloka in its Prakrit form:

माता पिता च भ्राता च भगिनीज्ञाति बान्धवाः।
सर्वे ज्येष्ठस्य ते भाराः एवं जानीहि भारत॥

The mother, father, brother, sister, kinsmen and relations - all these are a weight on the Jyeshtha, the eldest. In Ancient India, in the joint-family system, the eldest had to look after the welfare of the whole family. From Bhasa's standpoint, be it noted, it is Duryodhana that is the eldest, even elder to Yudhishthira. The epic had made Bhima and Duryodhana born on the same day. It had represented Dhritarāshtra as being constantly worried about his son's rights to the throne at least in succession to Yudhishthira, arguing that his son was born a few hours

he declared, ready to welcome any ~~man~~ man eager to visit Yama's abode. All jump to retort, but the grandfather's intervention deprives Ghatotkacha of his eager itching desire to fight the 'big guns' and beard them in their own den. When the latter demands a return message, Duryodhana proudly retorts that the time is not opportune for threats and intimidations and that the proper reply could only be given on the battlefield. As yet undaunted, Ghatotkacha refers to Śrī Kṛṣṇa's last message of adherence to duty and brotherly love to one's own kith and kin. He once again reminds them of Arjuna's vow that the next sunset would make them stand face to face, with himself deputising as Yama on the battlefield.

This alone among the five one-act dramas is referred to as an 'utsṛṣṭikanka' in the colophon. Some critics believed that this with the Madhyama Vyāyoga as I and Ūrubhanga as III acts, might have been a three-Act drama (like Pañcharātra) and this was later utsṛṣṭa or released from the group. Why the other two are not similarly styled in the colophons on this supposition is not clear. The actual word bharatavākya again is not found before the last śloka.

Such one-act dramas are as expressive as the short

to be wasted over this, but asks for the message. Ghatotkaca then delivers the same" Arjuna will sweep everything before him due to his grief and naturally the result will be the death of all the Kṣatriyas. Śakuni ridicules the idea saying that there was a wide gulf between boast and achievement. Ghatotkacha retorts that he cannot win any more victories by gambling and henceforward lives had to be staked and not gambling coins. Duryodhana is terribly incensed and insinuates that a Rakṣasa's son alone could exhibit so much cruelty and pride. The Rakṣasa boy hits back that the Kauravas were more cruel than they since they had not burnt their sleeping brethren, had not molested their brother's wife even to the extent of dragging her by the hair, and had not slain their brother's child (Abhimanyu here). Duryodhana insults him saying he is only a messenger whose simple business was that of a Post Office by delivering a return message. Such insolent behaviour, he said, deserves only death but his position as a dūta conferred some special privileges of immunity from danger etc. The envoy is ready to lose his special privilege and asserts that he was not a weakling with his bowstring broken like Abhimanyu. With clinched fists and lips, he was standing

entirely new. Ghatotkacha enters, announces himself as a messenger from Sri Krishna worried over Saubhadra's (Abhimanyu's) death. Duryodhana welcomes him. The envoy spies the grandfather also in the group and prostrates before him. When Dhṛtarāṣṭra stands up to hear Sri Kṛṣṇa's message, the envoy respectfully requests him to be seated and proceeds "The loss of one son has made Arjuna so much worried: at this rate we could imagine the misery of our grandfather on the death of all his sons as a result of Arjuna's anger. Therefore Sri Kṛṣṇa advises that the hostilities be brought to an end at least at this stage." Dhṛtarāṣṭra gives expression to his fear that Arjuna would certainly kill all the Kṣattriyas; but the others present ridicule the idea. Duryodhana at once protests that Kṛṣṇa is jealous of them and overestimates the might of Arjuna. All the same Ghatotkacha says he will have his say before he departs. Duśśāsana protests that Duryodhana, the anointed Emperor will not listen to the message of a vassal. Ghatotkacha takes offence to the declaration that Sri Kṛṣṇa is no anointed King and reminds them that the same Kṛṣṇa had received the first Arghya in Yudhiṣṭhira's Rājasūya from Bhiṣma's hand and so was really King of all Kings. Duryodhana does not want unnecessary words

armour,—and that he was under a curse. Śakuni at once retorts that the old King wants purposely to insult them and Dhṛtarāṣṭra accuses this gambler as being the one man at the bottom of all this tragedy; at this moment is heard a terrible earthquake shock accompanied by a mighty crash and shooting stars lighting up the firmament. Dhṛtarāṣṭra reminds them that Indra might have been at the back of all these portents since his grandson Abhimanyu was slain. Duryodhana sends the servant to ascertain the facts and he returns to say that Arjuna had just then vowed to kill the murderer of his son by next sunset. Duryodhana is particular to know what Arjuna has decided. Supposing he failed. He is informed that he has decided to enter fire along with his bow Gāṇḍiva. Duryodhana is very happy and declares that with the help of Drona he would shield Jayadratha and frustrate Arjuna's exploits. (Exactly the same is echoed by Bhaṭṭa Nārāyaṇa in his Veṇi Saṃhāra). Dhṛtarāṣṭra assures them that Kṛṣṇa's eyes were vigilant enough and would track out Jayadratha from any nook and corner of the earth or the sky.

So far the story has faithfully followed the epic version but the next message brought by Ghaṭotkacha is

death, particularly their much beloved and only daughter will have to face widowhood soon. Duryodhana wants to know why he was particularly singling out Jayadratha and the father replies that this Jayadratha had blocked the way for the other Pandava uncles to come up to the boy's rescue. Dhṛta-rāṣṭra roundly rates them for their having jointly killed a young boy. (Bhatta Nārāyaṇa imitates this in Act II of the Veṇīsaṁhāra). Duryodhana at once retorts that the Pandavas had similarly killed old Bhīṣma with false alarms, but the father dismisses the idea of comparing the two as ridiculous. The father emphasises the fact that even the son of Arjuna had terrorised them and Arjuna would certainly deprive them of their lives. Duryodhana positively refuses to believe this and the father reminds the son of Arjuna's various exploits in the Nivāta Kavacha, Kirātārjunīya yuddha, Khāṇḍava-vana fire and Chitrasena episodes, but the latter proudly retorts that there are on his side redoubtable warriors to match Arjuna. Dhṛtarāṣṭra asks him to name but one such. Duryodhana refers to Karna and is ridiculed by saying that Indra had taken the wind out of Karna's sails by depriving him of his

target for Arjuna's bows.[53] Dussalā wants permission to go to Uttarā, Abhimanyu's wife to apprentice herself to widowhood under her. Both the parents are trying to console her, saying that her husband is yet living, but they realise the hopelessness of her case particularly since Abhimanyu was the darling of Krsna and his elder brother Balarāma of the mighty plough over and above his being the pet son of the Pandavas. Dhrtarāstra wants to know how it was that Arjuna could allow his son to be killed and is then informed that Arjuna was engaged in a war with the Samsāptakas at one end and Abhimanyu was engaged in his fight at the other end of the battlefield. The other Pandavas were waiting to prepare the funeral pyre so that Arjuna could have a last glimpse of the corpse. Dhrtarāstra then proposes that they might go to the river Gangā to perform water libations (tarpana) for the dead. At this moment, Duryodhana, Dussāsana and Sakuni walk in to pay their respects to pay their respects to their parents before starting for the battle, but they are surprised to see that the old man is not blessing them in return. Duryodhana at once asks his father why he is not blessing them and the father in a pathetic sloka that they are all out for

this death will be serious. His wife also is worried that their family is going to be destroyed in this war of the brothers. Both of them are very much grieved on account of the death of their grandson and Dussalā joins in the conversation to say that the person who has made uttarā a widow is out to make his own wife also a widow (not knowing that her own husband had dealt the last stroke which had killed Abhimanyu). The blind King is now eager to know who has brought this sorrowful news and the messenger announces his own name as Jayatrāta. The king passes on to the next question: "Who was it that dealt the final blow? Who was it that careless of his own life, made his body the fuel for the fire of the anger of the Pandavas?" The messenger replies that there many big guns conspiring together, but the immediate cause of the death was Jayadratha, the husband of Dussalā. Naturally the old King and particularly the daughter start crying. The blind father asks who it is that weeps and the servant informs him it is his own daughter. The father is worried that her husband should have made himself the

The third one-act drama invents an interesting episode about Ghatotkacha's embassy soon after Abhimanyu's death. As we have it, the epic does not refer to any such embassy and we may suppose that this was woven in his fertile brain to fulfil his eagerness for sau-bhrātram or goodbrotherliness. The poet glorifies the 'madhyama' Abhimanyu and his cousin Ghatotkacha; both of them could be referred to as 'madhyamas in the making' or 'madhyama precocious kids' and seem to receive the title by courtesy as it were from their fathers.

The Sūtradhāra departs after informing us that Abhimanyu was killed by the combined efforts of the Kaurava heroes when Arjuna was engaged in his fight with the Saṃśaptakas in another corner of the battle-field. The Kauravas hosts are naturally apprehensive of Arjuna's terrible retaliation. A messenger is instructed to inform this news to Dhṛtarāṣṭra and the act proper shows us the blind old King talking to his wife, daughter Duśśalā and a doorkeeper servant. The old king has just heard the announcement and he is naturally afraid that the repercussions of this

The Skanda has been assigned to the middle of the 7th cen AD by Haraprasad Sastri JASB 1893 p. 250. Vaidya is in favour of assigning the compilation of the Bhāgavata to 900 AD (JBRAS 1925 I p144. The Agni, Garuda, & Narada purānas, saturated with Tantric doctrines and influenced as it is by the Bhakti cult cannot be placed earlier. No definite dates have been suggested for the compilation of Vāmana, Kūrma, Varāha, & Liṅga, but these must have come into being by 1000 AD as their existence is testified to by Al Beruni in 1037 AD. The Brahmavaivarta seems to have been thoroughly recast after the Chaitanya movement in Bengal; it might be safely assigned to the 15th cen, though its kernel might have been ready in the 10th cen.

is out for extermination[50] and openly announces that he was walking out of the Assembly. Duryodhana instructs his brothers to arrest the so-called Ambassador who had transgressed the bounds of ordinary messengers; when the brothers fail, he requests his uncle, to bind him. Finally he tries to bind him himself, but Kṛṣṇa exhibits his Viśvarūpa or universal form and the ropes with which others try to bind him are found on their own bodies the next moment. Duryodhana goes out to fetch his bow with which he proposes to shoot arrows at him. Ravi Varma, the famous Malabar artist, has made this scene popular by basing his picture on this drama and the popular epic account is also completely coloured by this scene. The next scene in which the various āyudhas of Kṛṣṇa and Garuḍa appear desirous of helping Kṛṣṇa is obviously spurious since they come and go without serving any purpose.

Just when Kṛṣṇa is about to go, the old Emperor Dhṛtarāṣṭra comes up in haste and welcomes the latter by offering him him arghya and pādya.

Purāṇas.

Most of the scholars like Pargiter are inclined to assign the 3rd cen. AD to the Markandeya Purāṇa though the Devī Māhātmya section was not added to it till after the 6th cen AD as Farquhar p. 150 points out. Next in order come the Padma, the Bhaviṣya, and the Brahma, verses from which have been freely quoted in the land grants of 5th cen. AD (JRAS. 1912 - p 248 ff). With reference to the Padma, which is encyclopaedic in character, though Kālidāsa made use of it, & the frequent mention of the term द्वादशी therein, make it probable that a part of the text was known from the 4th cen. AD in the Marāṭhā country, it will be more reasonable if we can see our way to assign a period beginning from 4th cen AD, rather than a particular date for the composition of the work. In regard to the Bhaviṣyapurāṇa, Āpastamba Dharmasūtra of the 5th cen BC. quotes from a भविष्यपुराण II 24.6, yet the Bombay edn. of the text seems to have been sufficiently recast at the court of Jayachandra of Kanauj in 12th cen AD.

Then come in the Vāyu, Matsya, Viṣṇu & Brahmāṇḍa which on grounds of historical data furnished by these texts, have been assigned to 5th cen AD by Smith and Pargiter. So most of the Purāṇas as we have them today might have been compiled from the 3rd to the 5th cen. AD.

demanded Kṛṣṇa's abstention from boasting about his own prowess particularly since he had fled as a coward to save himself from Jarāsandha, Kaṁsa's fatherinlaw. The latter once again sternly directs him to follow parliamentary rules in a legally constituted Assembly and once again requests him to forget the past and welcome his brothers. Duryodhana repeats his charge that the Pāṇḍavas are illegitimate sons of the various gods and human beings, like him, could not claim any kinship with them at all. Kṛṣṇa then mentally decides to frighten him with harsh words and reminds him of Arjuna's various exploits, particularly the one in which Duryodhana himself was formerly saved in the Ghoṣayātrā episode from Chitrasena by Arjuna himself. Duryodhana refuses to be frightened by this intimidation and declares that he could never be cowed down into surrendering even a small blade of grass from the kingdom inherited by him from his father. He further insults him as a cowherd who should not even be talked to according to the Dharmaśāstras since he has killed women, horses, bulls, and even wrestlers and even declares he would not talk to persons like him. Kṛṣṇa feels highly insulted, declares the Kuru race

Krishna's story, 5 Pandavas related by the Jātaka V 426.7 of Fausboll's Edn and also the story of the Andhaka Vṛṣṇis related in the Ghaṭajātaka No 454; IV. P. 794). Dr Venkatasubbiah concludes that under the circumstances it is not too far fetched to conjecture that the name of the story was originally Avikumāra and that this was in course of time corrupted into Acimāraka and explanations then invented in support of the corrupted name. It cannot be exactly guessed whether Bhasa's original was Guṇāḍhya's Bṛhatkathā which is reputed to have existed in Paiśācī language. Similarly the story in Bhasa's Udayana dramas does not seem to agree fully with the K.S.S. and one is tempted to hazard the guess that it might agree with Guṇāḍhya's original as perhaps preserved in its Tamil version in the Perungadai. As a matter of fact, Tamil scholars of repute like Pūrṇalingam Pillai in his Tamil literature published by the Bibliotheca Munnirpallam 1929 definitely suspects that the Paiśācha work of Guṇāḍhya is the Tamil Perungadai itself. → (Turn back) Abhisheka

division of ancestral property since the Pandavas were born illegitimately after his uncle was cursed into not sharing the bed with his aunt. Krṣṇa at once retorts this by declaring that at this rate even his father also was illegitimately born after Vichitravirya's death and therefore could not have inherited the kingdom. Such fratricidal hatred was only suicidal and Krṣṇa rounds up by requesting Duryodhana to comply with Yudhisthira's message. Duryodhana proudly retorts that kingdoms are not to be begged but acquired through personal valour and even suggests that their meek policy deserved nothing better than a hermit's position in a forest. Krṣṇa requests him not to use such harsh words against his own kith and kin which was reprehensible from the moral viewpoint of the Smṛtis. Duryodhana at once retorts that Kaṇṇa had himself started his career by murdering his own maternal uncle (father's sister's husband). Krṣṇa directs him not to bring in extraneous matter into the present context, silencing his adversary by saying that Kamsa had killed his own sister's children, imprisoned his ~~own~~ father, and so deserved no better fate. But the latter persisted in declaring that Kamsa was deceived and steadily

5. Goat-killer's real father was the king of Kosala according to the Jātaka; as per the other 2 versions it was Agni.

6. Goat-killer's mother was a Brahmana maiden as per the K.S.S. and a Brahmana's young wife as per the Jaya. As per the Jātaka, she was the chief queen of the King of Kosala and of King Brahmadatta and as per the Nātaka, the queen of Pāsenadi.

7. Goat-killer's foster father was a Sūdra as per the Jaya, while as per the Jātaka and the K.S.S., he was a Chāndāla. As per the Nātaka, he was a Kshattriya, who temporarily for the period of a year, was a Chandala. Of these 4 versions, that of the Jaya is most free from supernatural elements; it seems to be nearest to the original form of the story. The versions of the Nātaka and Jātaka seem to diverge widely from this original; that of the Nātaka has in it a great number of supernatural elements; there can be no element that they are mostly due to the author of the play, and in order to embellish the plot. The divergences in the Jātaka seem to be due to what may be called the habit of caricatering, which the Buddhist writers indulged in when writing Brahmanical stories; compare

addresses Duryodhana if he is seated and the latter suddenly slips from his seat receiving an electric shock as it were and realises that the ambassador he has to deal with is a tricky fellow; putting on an air of courtesy meekly requests him to be seated. Elated with his initial triumph, Kṛṣṇa takes his seat dramatically, directing the others in the assembly to be seated. His attention is natu-rally drawn to the artistic picture spread before Duryo-dhana; he realises at once what it is and chides the latter for publicly exhibiting their own family disgrace. He even orders the Kanchukin to remove the picture and Duryodhana has to signify his approval. Not real-ising the lesson of this initial defeat, Duryodhana, sneeringly enquires after the welfare of 'five sons of the respective gods' and their dependents. Kṛṣṇa of course understands the irony but pretends to take no notice of the same; he affectionately made kind inquiries of the welfare of the Kauravas; he then proposes that the Pāṇḍavas who have suffered untold miseries in the stipulated period of their exile should be given their legitimate share of the ancestral property. Duryodhana takes offence at the word dāyādyam or

that he received such a name as he was so strong even as a child as to grasp goats and sheep only to kill them.

2. The Kathāsaritsāgara does not give him any name, but calls him Mātaṅga Kumāra; the heroine is called Kuraṅgī in the Nāṭaka and K.S.S. but her name is not given in the Jaya mangalā, while in the Jātaka she is called Kuraṅgavī or Kuraṅgadevī.

(The K.S.S. 112.105 says: ततस्ते प्राप्य गण्डूषं रुधिरस्येव वर्धिताः - tended with goat's milk)

3. There is nothing said in the Jātaka about goat-killer's saving the life of a princess. The other versions however make out that he saved her from an elephant. This incident took place in a park in a city according to the Jaya mangalā and the Nāṭaka; according to K.S.S. in a forest.

4. There is nothing said in the Jātaka about goat-killer's saving the life of the princess. The other versions however make out that he saved her from an elephant. This incident took place in a park in the city.

4. The Nāṭaka and Jātaka make out that goat-killer married the princess according to the Gandharva form; the Jaya too seems to suggest the same, while K.S.S. on the other hand, makes out that the marriage took place regularly.

guished guest should be received with public honours. The King however is inclined to veto their unanimous decision and suggests that the so-called Messenger, the friend, philosopher and 'eye' of the Pāndavas should be arrested. He even goes on to order that whoever dared stand up to honour the guest would incur his displeasure and would be punished twelve golden coins. He then instructs the Kanchuki to spread before him a picture of Drapadi's tresses being dragged by Duśśāsana so that he might pretend to be absorbed in the picture when the dūta was being ushered in so that he could avoid standing up to receive the guest. After this is done, the Kanchukin is asked to introduce the guest and the latter slowly walks in behind him.

The august guest slowly enters and the entire assembly, though fully remembering the severe displeasure that would be caused to Duryodhana thereby, almost forgot the order and stood up in confusion. Kṛṣṇa naturally requested them in a dignified manner to be seated even as Duryodhana was murmuring sufficiently aloud reminding the assembly about his erstwhile threat to fine them. Kṛṣṇa now directly

in love with this handsome boy. She was the handsome daughter of King Brahmadatta. The two carried on an intrigue unsuspected by others. Brahmadatta came to know of this intrigue after some time and decided to punish the daring Chandāla youth. The King of Kosala, the guardian deity of the boy and his real father understood this and possessed the boy's mother and made her reveal that the boy was really her own son and not a Chandāla as he appeared to be. This was further confirmed by Brahmadatta's secret enquiries and the king now blessed the marriage.

This story makes us conclude that Bhāsa and the Jātaka were no doubt based upon the same story; the Kathāsaritsāgara 112-verses 9 to 108 also narrate a similar story. Jayamangalā, the commentary on Vātsyāyana's Kāmasūtra V.iv.14 also seems to narrate a similar story. There are however some minor differences of detail 1. The hero is called Ēlakamāraka in the Jātaka as goats were killed because of his supposed inauspicious entry into their fold. But in the drama, he kills a demon in the form of a goat; the Jayamangalā commentary suggests

Dūtavākya. The next one-Act drama in which the central figure is Sri Krishna, is the Dūtavākya. The title refers to the 'ambassador's word' and the drama starts with a Sthāpanā which informs us that Duryodhana is intending to convoke a Cabinet meeting to discuss who the Commander of the Kaurava hosts should be in the impending war with the Pandavas. Vaikarṇa, Vāsudeva, his advisers, Bhīṣma, Droṇa, Śakuni, Karṇa and other important Kuru leaders are shown various seats in the assembly and Duryodhana requests them to name the fittest person to become the C-in-C of his eleven Akṣauhiṇis. All of them agree that Bhīṣma alone is best fitted for the post and this decision is ratified by Duryodhana. At this moment, the Kanchuki announces that Sri Kṛṣṇa "Puruṣottama" has just then arrived from the Pāṇḍava camp for negotiations. The Emperor is incensed at the word Puruṣottama inadvertently slipped from the Kanchuki's lips and orders him to use his words more carefully. The Kanchuki apologises and announces that the Dūta or Messenger Keśava is arrived. Duryodhana then requests the assembly as to how best the reception to the Messenger should be arranged and every one is agreed that such a distin

p113. The story may be summarised thus: Brahmadatta once fought with and killed in battle a king of Kosala. His kingdom was annexed and the pregnant chief queen was married by him. When the queen was delivered of a handsome boy a few days later, she suspected that her new husband might get the boy murdered as he was the son of his enemy and so she instructed a nurse to cover the child in a piece of cloth and abandon it in a cemetery. The child's dead father became its guardian deity and silently instructed one of the goats to suckle the child. The goatherd slowly came to know of the child and passed it on to his wife since they were childless; but the goats in the herd began to die in twos and threes from that day. This made the goatherd apprehensive and he again abandoned it by putting the child in an earthen vessel and casting it adrift in a river. This vessel and the child therein were rescued by a Chandala who was also childless and adopted it. Later this handsome boy went with his supposed father, the Chandala to the king's palace and took there along with his father. The princess Kuranganī (Kuranganāsī in 2 mss consulted by Faustoll) fell

---

1 Bhima had instructed her at the time of his marriage: Adiparva 168,17 — विशेषतो मत्सकाशे मा प्रकाशय नीचतां। उत्तमस्त्रीगुणोपेता गच्छेथाः क्षत्रवाणिनि ॥ and Hidimbā, we feel, but acts up to this strict injunction.

all of them put together and Bhima purposely denies this. Ghatotkacha now grandiloquently asks Bhima to take up his weapon and fight. Bhima replies his hands are his only weapons. Ghatotkacha plucks up a mighty tree and lots mountain peaks and hurls them against Bhima, but the latter easily withstands it. Even in the fist-to-fist fight, Ghatotkacha is worsted. Being at his wits' end, he thinks of his superior magical missiles to bind his adversary with. Because of his supernatural powers, he can easily procure water needed for the holy ācamana or the sipping of the water before discharging his māyapāśa which has been his mother's gift; Bhima at once is tied up mysteriously. But soon he recovers his self-possession and asks the Brahmin for water from his water-basin, does the ācamana likewise and repeats the vimoḥanamantra (to make the pāśa impotent) which he has been taught by Maheśvara. Ghatotkacha finds himself powerless, reminds his adversary about his offer to substitute himself. Bhima readily consents to be led by his son to his mother's side, only to be warmly welcomed and prostrated to by his wife and son! ∈

Nārada who sees that everything ends happily by reconciling warring elements. At Kuntibhoja's instance, he bows before the Divine sage, who blesses the new couple. The couple prostrate before Kuntibhoja and lastly the prince prostrates before his father who once again instructs his son to prostrate before his maternal uncle, who is now his Fatherinlaw also. Nārada instructs the couple to prostrate before Sudarśanā whose motherly affection for her boy is now rekindled and the drama ends happily with the future marriage of Jayavarmā and Sumitrā happily settled now itself. The usual Bharatavākya or prayer for welfare of Cows and Brahmins brings it to an end.

The drama exhibits similarities with various stories narrated in the Bhāgavata Purāṇa. For example, the exchange of the child of Sudarśanā with Suchetanā's still-born baby reminds us of the exchange of Devakī's baby in Nandagopa's hut. The story of Arimāraka's stealthy life in Kuranga's apartments reminds us of Aniruddha in Usā's apartments. Dr A. Venkatasubbiah refers to a curious Buddhist parallel to the Arimāraka = Elakamāraka story in Kuṭṭala jātaka V. 412 - Fausboll's Edn. - Indian Antiquary '31,

The other real madhyama also turns up in the mean-
while; Bhima is already determined to save the
family and demands of Ghatotkacha the release
of the Brahmin boy. When Ghatotkacha refuses, Bhima
is surprised and slowly elicits the information that
the Rakṣasa boy is after all Hidimba's son. Bhima
does not announce himself, but proposes to follow Ghato-
tkacha in the place of the Brahmin boy. The self-respecting
boy however refuses to allow such a handsome person
as Bhima to be the cannibal's victim. Ghatotkacha is
agreeable to the exchange, but Bhima quietly
suggests that they should have a trial of strength
before Ghatotkacha could take him to his mother.
Both agree and fight, but Ghatotkacha feels his
strength sinking. Bhima wishes to tickle
his son and asks him whether his father about
whom he was boasting was equal to any one of
the mighty gods like Brahma, Śiva, Viṣṇu,
Śakra or Subrahmanya or even Yama in respect
of his might. The latter replies that he is equal to

on the plea that he would give his daughter in marriage to that prince. In consequence of that invitation it was that these had arrived in the city that morning, escorted by Pohitika. Narada instructs him to be aside for a while and calls Sudarsana near him. She comes to be told in a whisper that Vismusena also was really her own son born of the Fire-God. The startled Queen somehow has to nod her head accepting the truth of the assertion and Narada further explains how the boy was passed on to Suchetana when she was blessed with a still-born son. "Later that very boy has won laurels by killing a Rakshasa in goat-form and further later still, he rescued the princess from the elephant, won her through sheer might, but later when found out, fled away, was protected mysteriously and is now again, with the help of superior supernatural powers, mysteriously wedded to that very princess. After all, he is your own son. Accept the marriage as a settled fact and explain that Kuranji is older in age to Jayavarma. Kuranji's younger sister, Sumitra, can be married to Jaya-varma." This is accepted by Sudarsana and now the pair Vismusena and Kuranji, escorted by Pohitika enter the hall. Vismusena is able to recognise

himself, the father says he cannot bear separation from him and the mother is similarly attached to the youngest. By a process of elimination, the middle one understands he is unwanted and offers himself up as the proposed victim and is accepted. Before starting however, he says he will drink some water to quench his thirst in a neighbouring lake and is permitted to go. But desirous of delaying his own death by a few minutes at least, he spends his time sightseeing and Ghatotkacha becomes impatient and asks for the name of that boy. On being informed that the name is madhyama, he calls out at the top of his voice, asking him to present himself. It so happens Bhima hears this in his morning round, and since he is also a madhyama, he also comes up. Then Ghatotkacha looks at him surprised. Bhima assures him he is the only madhyama. The old Brahmin understands he must be the madhyama and humbly requests him to save them from this Rakshasa like person.

Narada invites them to get their mysteries explained; they all naturally ask 'Why is Vijnasena not seen?' The sage mysteriously answers 'He is preoccupied with his marriage' and the intrigued Kuntibhoja dashes the next question 'Where is the marriage celebrated?' The sage coolly answers 'In Vaijayanta nagara.' The bewildered Kuntibhoja rushes on with the next question 'Whose son-in-law is he then?' and Narada calmly replies 'Kuntibhoja's.' This explanation takes their breath away and Kuntibhoja now asks 'How is it, is he then my son-in-law?' The sage then explains that their Gandharva vivāha had followed soon after the rescue of the princess by the prince - and that in the beginning the prince had entered by sheer might and escaped later; but now he was living there by his magic powers. Naturally Kuntibhoja wishes that the marriage should be solemnised in all pomp with legal rites but Narada satisfies him that the Fire-God is a witness to the marriage in a mysterious sense. Narada now directs Bhūtika to go and escort the pair into their presence. In the meanwhile, Kuntibhoja explains to Narada that he has a mental reservation inasmuch as he had invited that very day Jayavarmā and his mother to his palace

itself in a peculiar sense as referring to a stalwart youth. The Amarakośa refers to the word in the feminine gender as dṛṣṭarajāḥ or a young vigorous woman in her full menstrual flow. This word is not current now and Bhāsa seems to have been familiar with the word in the masculine gender also]. Bhāsa's imagination has invented a lively story by which Hidimbā manages to entice Bhīma to her abode. She has heard that the five Pāṇḍavas have come to the forest and is eagerly waiting to welcome her husband in her home, but she does so in a novel manner. She pretends to fast on a particular day and instructs her son to bring a sturdy youth for her feast the next day. The son waylays the Brahmin family and proposes to them that if they could spare one of them for his mother's breakfast, the rest could easily escape. Naturally the father offers himself up to Ghaṭotkacha, but the latter says his mother will not be satisfied with an old man. The mother also is similarly rejected. When the eldest son offers

queen's apartments. After some mutual explanations of past events, Kuntibhoja wants to know how it was that Śiśupāla had earned the title of Arimāraka and the episode of the prince's killing with his bare hands a Rākṣasa in the form of a goat which was causing so much destruction to human life is narrated. Kuntibhoja is really happy to realise that the person who has rescued his daughter some time ago is his own brother-in-law's son, Śiśupāla, who has also added to his fame by killing a mighty cannibal in the form of a goat. Bhūtika has thoroughly investigated all possible places where possibly the prince might be found and is driven to the inevitable conclusion that the prince is never living somewhere with the help of supernatural powers. At this very moment, as though to confirm the truth of Bhūtika's investigations, Nārada walks in to be welcomed by all with due honours and explains he has understood they are worried because of the strange absence of the Saurira ~~prince~~. He orders Bhūtika to bring Sudarśanā into the room and Sudarśanā is supremely happy to find that the divine sage Nārada is come to bless her son's marriage with Kuraṅgi. In her presence

dramatists like Bhavabhuti or Bhatta Narayana refer to Arjuna as the Madhyamapandava counting the sons of Mādri also, but almost all of Bhasa's heroes are madhyamas like Bhima. This definition of such stalwart heroes refers to their being 'bhujāyudhapradhānas' or their fighting with their hands alone as their weapons and his favourite examples are Bhima and Balarama - Pancharātra III.14 - drōṇa dorbhyām samare prayātau halāyudhaścaiva Vṛkodaraścha. The way in which these three madhyamas are brought together is entertaining. A small Brahmin family consisting of the old parents and three sons is proceeding to the next village for an upanayana ceremony in a relation's house. Naturally one 'madhyama' is among them. Ghatotkacha, Hidimba's son, waylays them; he may not literally be a madhyama, but being Bhima's son, he might indirectly inherit the title from his father. Bhasa himself seems to have used the word madhyama

Kāśirāja prince has been viewed with favour by Kuranga's father; Bhūtika, the minister was therefore sent to escort the Queen Sudarśanā (sister of the father of Kuranga) and her son Jayavarmā to the city of Kuntibhoja. Vasumitrā, another maid, comes here to inform them that an auspicious day for Kuranga's marriage with her cousin Jaya Varmā was also fixed. But there is also a ray of hope inasmuch as the father of the Saurira prince Viṣṇusena was also arrived that day to report that he and other members of his family were freed from the curse of an irascible sage but the prince, his son was mysteriously away. The two maids depart hoping that a happy solution might be somehow found.

The Act proper starts with Saurira rāja, escorted by Bhūtika into Kuntibhoja's presence. The long separated relations naturally embrace each other and the Saurira King informs his brother-in-law that though they are now happy being freed from a curse, the absence of the son Viṣṇusena now is the only thought which oppresses his heart. The detail of the curse as a result of which the entire family had to live as Chandālas in a cheri are now explained and Bhūtika explains that he has just now also escorted Viṣṇusena's mother into the

The five one-act dramas in their natural order deserve our next consideration. They are 'gems of the purest ray serene' and allow fullest possible scope for the exhibition of the poet's dramatic skill. They are Madhyamavyayoga, Duta Vākya, Dutaghatotkacha, Karnabhāra, and Urubhanga. One character alone is the most important in each one of these; for example, Ghatotkacha in the 1st and 3rd, Kṛṣṇa in the 2nd, Karṇa in the 4th and Duryodhana in the last. Though the Bharata epic story is mainly followed in them, there are certain episodes not known in the original at all. These episodes invest a wonderful charm and we summarise them and translate a few select scenes here and there.

The first is Madhyamavyayoga and refers to the Vyayoga or dilemma about a madhyama. Bhima is the madhyama or the middle son of Kunti and the drama cleverly brings in these such middle sons together dramatically. Later

inside. Rational explanations follow; the unexpected heavy rains make them all go inside and the act ends happily, but leaving the couple to continue their incognito life alone inside the princess's apartment. We might digress a little here and explain that the scene in which the princess tries to strangle herself only to be rescued by her invisible lover is imitated by Śrī Harṣa in his Nāgānanda Act II.12. where the heroine's attempt to strangle herself is foiled by the hero in a lovely śloka

काष्ठे हारलतायोग्ये येन पाशस्त्वयार्पितः ।
गृहीतः साधुरेवोऽयं स कथं मुच्यते करः ॥

The VI act continues to tell us that the dramatist who found that the introduction of a magic ring could not make the drama end happily has to introduce another supernatural element, viz the sage Nārada to bring about a happy denouement.

The Act starts with a Praveśaka which introduces a small complication. Dhātrī, the nurse of Kuraṅgī, who is in the know of the secret union of the princess and Avimāraka from the beginning, is worried that a small last moment hitch has come up in that the absence of the family of Viśvasena (for that is the real name of Avimāraka), the proposal from the

Ravana - What you wicked fellow! afraid of battles! What? He who has defeated all the gods headed by Indra, this my Indrajit, you say, has been killed by an ordinary mortal?

Rakṣasa - Be pleased, your Majesty! Could I dare to utter an untruth with reference to the Crownprince before your Majesty?

Ravana - Alas! my son Meghanada (faints & falls)

Rakṣasa - Be consoled, my lord (fans him).

Ravana (recovering) - Alas! my child! the Fright of all the worlds! Expert in archery! you had trampled under foot the enemy hordes headed by Indra! brave, obedient, pastmaster in war, why hast thou departed, leaving me all alone! (again faints)

Rakṣasa - Alas! the Conqueror of the three worlds, Lankā lord has been brought to such a pass by inverse Fate!

The scene goes on like this, but enough has been translated to show how Ravana wants to tantalise Sitā into submission, but Fate itself tantalises him!

put an end to her life, tries to commit suicide, sending away Nalinikā on some pretext, asking her to get ready the upasnāna or the showerbath for her. The maid has suspected some ulterior purpose in the princess' mind, but does not expect that she would put an end to her life too soon and departs. Exactly at that moment, the queen, the mother of the princess, hears of her daughter's 'headache' and sends some 'Amrutanjan' to be applied to the head. The princess pretends to accept the medicine gratefully and hastily sends away the maid, asking her to quicken the upasnāna that was being got ready. Finding that she is all alone now, the princess prepares to strangle herself with her upper part of the saree, unfortunately for her, a thunderclap unnerves her and she cries out to be helped by the invisible hero who was along observing her keenly. He embraces her and she feels her agony vanishing. The Vidūṣaka is also there and the entry of Nalinikā at the moment is barred by the fact that the princess has bolted the room from inside as a preliminary to fulfilling her long cherished desire. Avimāraka is able to recognise Nalinikā's voice and softly admits the wondering, though happy maid

I am. Where art thou gone' my lord, throwing me into a sea of sorrow? I am not dying even now. Oh God, if this could be false! Friend (addressing the servant), strike that sword with which you severed my Lord's head, cut off mine, also.

Ravana. (Laughingly) Evidently when that base man (Rama) along with his brother has been killed by Indrajit, who can dare rescue you?

(Inside is heard the cry, by Rama, by Rama)

Sita. Live long (heaves a sigh).

(Entering)

Another Rakṣasa (in confusion) – by Rama, by Rama.

Ravana. What! What! (contemptuously), why bother about Rama?

Rakṣasa. May your Majesty be pleased! In my eagerness to inform an urgent matter, I did not bother about the circumstances.

Ravana. But with your urgent news! What has that mortal ascetic done?

Rakṣasa – The Maharaja should deign to listen. That man of mighty prowess has routed your armies and accompanied by his brother Lakṣmaṇa has today killed your son Indrajit.

about the desperate princess he has left behind. He decides to give up his life somehow praying sincerely for her union at least in the next birth at least. But he finds that fire is simply embracing him and is only cooling him since in reality he was Fire-God's son. He now prepares to let himself from a big precipice; exactly at this moment, Vidyādhara happens to pass that way in the sky along with his wife. He sees the hero in such a desperate condition, understands his heart's anguish through his divine power and sympathising with him, offers him a ring with which he can continue to live undetected and invisible in the princess' palace as before. The ring is a magic ring enabling the wearer and his friend to become invisible and the hero gratefully accepts the ring and his old happy life is once again restored, but alas! he has no opportunity of publicly announcing himself as the princess' legally married husband. The Vatsa enters with the Vidūṣaka also inside the princess' apartments, exactly reintroducing the conditions of the end of Act III and the hero is unable to cut the Sphinx knot, trying to find his way into the princess' palace.

The IV act starts with the desperate princess and Kuraṅgi on one side and Aviṃārakā and his friend in another. The princess, mentally deciding to

What if she goes! Let her go. What do I care for her. Let me now try to seduce Sitā. (Passionately) Oh! the unparalleled strength of Cupid!

My eyes look at Sitā's face and forget sleep,
My emaciated body eager to embrace her has become pale,
Even in respect of pleasant things, my affliction is increased,
Rāvaṇa who conquers the three worlds is routed by Cupid!

(Approaching Sitā)

Oh Sitā, possessed of eyes, wide like the lotus,
Oh mistress of my heart! forget your love towards a mortal! See thy lord and Lakṣmaṇa felled in battle by me!

Sitā - Thou art a fool, trying to balance the Mount Mandara on thy palm.

(Enters a soldier Rākṣasa)

Rākṣasa - Here are the heads of these mortal princes, Rāma and Lakṣmaṇa killed in battle by Prince Indrajit.

Rāvaṇa - Now, I say, look at them!

Sitā - Alas! my lord! (faints).

Rāvaṇa - Sitā, terminate your affection towards this dead person and obtain abundant riches even today, this very instant.

Sitā - Alas! my lord! Looking up at the fresh, lotus-like and upturned eyes of my Lord, I survive, hardhearted

princess is being slowly reassured by the hero that they are now having the Saptapadī, the traditional and sacred seven steps solemnising the marriage and the princess silently nods her approval as it were and they walk in together hand in hand with their pāṇi grahaṇa ceremony solemnised. The act ends happily.

The act starts with the information that the happy pair had their Elysian joys in the night. Though the day has sufficiently advanced in the morning, the princess has not opened the door of her apartment and another maid who has no inkling into the latest secret is alarmed. Wonderfully however, with the connivance of the two maids, the pair manage their secret connubium for almost a year, but after that the minister has some inkling about these nefarious episodes, the guards in the antaḥpura are strengthened and again with their connivance, the hero cleverly manages to elude the gaze of the police and escapes. The maids give us this information in a Praveśaka at the beginning and inform us that Princess Ratnāvalī finds it very difficult to carry on her existence. The act proper starts with Ārimāraka, the desperate hero at his wits' end. His one anxious thought is

Vibhisana - My lord! be pleased. I myself will go. I have been punished. Innocent as I am, I depart. Putting aside feeling of passion and anger, act as thou wilt. (walking up) Today alone will I resort to that lordly mortal and will certainly restore the sinking fortunes of our Rakṣasa family brought to the brink of ruin! [Exeunt.

This next scene is from V act where Rawana first tries remonstrate with Royalty (personified as a woman) of Lanka who is slowly trying to go away. Later a servant brings two false heads of Rama and Lakṣmana as per Rawana's instructions to frighten Sita. Fortunately for her Indrajit's death is first then announced. Let us hear Rawana

Rawana - Oh! don't go. This lady Lanka with a fresh lotus in her hand was captured by me after defeating Kubera in battle. She is now abandoning my home. Stay! Stay! respectable lady! you don't go. What do you say - You leave me to go to Rama. Fie upon you. Thou wast captured by force in Kubera's abode, Even now will I capture thee after killing Rama in battle!

watchmen on the way, Arimāraka lets himself into the princess' apartments to be welcomed as pre-planned by the maid Nalinikā who was waiting for him. She quietly leads him onto the bed of the 'Sleeping Beauty' and instructs him to sit softly and silently by her. 'Sweet is success after toil' muses the hero and starts gazing, to his hearts ~~anguish~~ completely satisfaction. In her sleep, the princess is worried at the prospect of her sweet love being detected and asks whether she has unconsciously uttered anything in her sleep which might disclose her secret love. Nalinikā assures her (who is yet with her eyes closed) that she has not done any such thing. The bewitched hero stands observing all this to become more and more spellbound and reaps the reward of his nightly escapade. The princess again asks for the time, even now with her eyes closed and she is informed it is midnight. She now asks the maid to embrace her and the maid silently pushes the hero and instructs him to respond. The latter willingly does so; the heroine realises her mistake but only too late and trembles like an aspen leaf, only to be reasoned by the hero. The nurse enters at this moment to inform that she has arranged two beds for them inside the bedroom and the happy pair quietly walk in. The silent

Ravana - If that be palatable, we hear.

Vibhisana - I should like to think that our family is brought to the brink of ruin by your act.

Ravana Why?

Vibhisana because of your Majesty's perverted policy.

Ravana - What is my perverted policy?

Vibhisana - Why, this Sita episode itself.

Ravana - What of that?

Vibhisana - so much of sin, too.

Ravana Your last word 'too' seems to imply something more. Out with it.

Vibhisana (quivers) - That very thing.

Ravana. Vibhisana, why hide. I swear to thee by all I hold sacred, if thou dost not speak the truth.

Vibhisana Your Majesty must grant me a-bhaya (immunity from punishment).

Ravana - granted. Speak.

Vibhisana: you are not for a war with a mighty enemy

Ravana (angrily) - What! What! a mighty enemy indeed! This vile Rakshasa, a fifth columnist dares call me a coward. Who is here? I wish not to see this inimical fellow on whom my good to the clever is wasted. Let him be necked out.

The princess asks for the time; she is told dusk has set in; she orders the maid to prepare the bed for her. The maid assures her she has already arranged the bed. She is unnecessarily chided for her supposed laziness and they proceed to the sleeping apartment. The maids misunderstand that the princess is over-joyed at the prospect of her marriage with Kāśirāja-putra whose proposal has just then been accepted by her parents and even the auspicious nakṣatram for the celebration of the marriage had been decided upon. But the princess has definitely set her face against that marriage. The despondent princess slowly relaxes herself and dozes off into a small nap. On the other side of the stage, sufficiently in a distant corner, Avimaraka also enters, shrouded in hair, and dressed as a thief, readily equipped for any undue mishap. It is in this context that Bhasa advises men through his hero to put forth assiduously their efforts and exhibit their manliness irrespective of the ultimate success or defeat, all the while trusting in God's helpful attitude. After meeting some small mishaps and carefully avoiding the night

The vilest of the night-wandering Rakshasas, Ravana!
With all your merits exhausted, how dare you speak
of the heroes, unmatched and brave and almost
equal to Indra of heaven, the one lord of the worlds?
Ravana - How dare he speak thus? Let him be killed.
a rake, an ambassador should not be killed.
Sankukarna, let his tail be set fire to and then
release him.
Sankukarna. As your Majesty orders! Monkey, this way!
Ravana - Or Come this side.
Hanuman, At your service, sire.
Ravana. Let that mortal be told in my name:
Rama, you have been overpowered by me since I
have plundered your wife. If you have the might give
me deserving battle.
Hanuman. In a short time thou will see your Lanka
with all its lovely gopuramas sacked by Rama's mighty
bow, and your lovely pleasure parks destroyed by monkeys.
Ravana (Sneeringly) drive this monkey from my presence.
(Rakshasas drive away the monkey. Hanuman Exit).
Vibhisana. Be pleased to listen, my lord! I wish to offer
some salutary advice.

They assure him that if he once manages an entry unobserved, he might continue to live undetected for a long time. They depart after assuring him of their whole-hearted support and also after receiving an assurance that he will come at midnight. The Vidūṣaka, his Brahmin friend, now joins him; when he is informed of their impending night adventure, he is naturally apprehensive of the dangers that might beset their path, but Aśimāraka reminds him of his erstwhile prowess whereby he had defeated a giant in the form of a goat and was so named. They spend the time till sunset in a friend's house in the city. They spend the time till sunset in a friend's house in the city and the act ends.

The IIIrd act shows us the princess and her maids in a conversation. The former is trying to elicit what sort of reply the so-called Chandāla receiver had given to the representation made to him on her behalf, but in her absent-mindedness, she has asked some other maid and she without understanding, she has asked some other maid; and the latter without understanding the implication refers to some other servant who had not prepared the parrot-cage.

or even in the world's underneath; but my excellent arrow will pierce all the limbs of your body and dispatch you to Yama's abode.

Ravana - (sneeringly) - Ha! Ha! Ha! The heavenly hosts with their celestial weapons were overpowered by me, all the gods are my obedient servants; I am Pauliastya who has carried away triumphantly the Pushpaka vimāna; how can a mortal dare destroy me!

Hanuman - Mighty as thou art, sire, why did you steal Rama's wife stealthily?

Vibhisana - Well said, Hanumān; oh best of Rakshasas you enticed Rama away by a trick, disguised as a beggar and eloped with her, is it not?

Ravana - Vibhisana, are you turning traitor?

Vibhisana - Be pleased my lord; listen to my salutary advice. Offer up Raghava's wedded wife. I do not wish that our family should be destroyed by noble thee.

Ravana - Vibhisana, away with fear:
How can the lion with the long mane be mauled by a deer
Or an infuriated and mighty elephant be killed by a fox?

Hanuman - O Ravana, is it proper for thee with thy sinking fortunes to speak of Raghava thus? For heaven's sake, do not perish.

suicide if her heart's stealer would not be by her side. They manage to reach his apartments in the
(their unobserved by him and are encouraged by
a heavenly voice which assures them of the
ultimate success of their self-imposed benevolent
task. On the verandah in front of his house, the
hero is trying hard to recollect the form of the girl
whom he has rescued and this reassures them
once again that the mission they have undertaken
has started under good auspices. After some time
of mental retrospect, Arimānaka suddenly realises
that guests have come to his humble abode. He welcomes
them with a look of embarassment. They ask him if
he is happy and he assures them that he could be
so if only they assure him of their help. They ask
him what he is thinking about and he with some
confusion, confesses it is a scientific topic. On being
pressed to name it, he confesses it is Yogaśāstra.
The maid assures him they are also come there with
the same purpose of yoga or union. To make a
long story short, they encourage him in his venture,
invite him to her apartment by supplying with the
topography of the princess' apartments in the royal palace.

brother Vibhisana who is advising him to surrender Sita to Rama, but he turns a deaf ear to the suggestion. At this moment, the monkey is ushered into the august presence and let us hear the Conversation.

Vibhisana - My lord! ask the monkey who he is.

Ravana - Oh monkey, who art thou? How dare you enter our Harem and destroy our lovely park, Asokavana?

Hanuman - Be pleased to listen:

Born of Anjana, I am the wind-god's son,
Sent by Rāghava and my name is Hanumān.

Vibhisana - Did you hear, my lord!

Ravana - What of that?

Vibhisana - Hanumān, What does the respectable Rama say?

Hanuman - Sire, hear Rama's Command.

Ravana - What does he mean by saying Command?
Damn it, let the monkey be killed!

Vibhisana - Be pleased, my Lord. Ambassadors are holy in International Law. Rather let us hear Rama's message and then Your Majesty may act as you deem fit.

Ravana - Oh monkey, what does that human being say?

Hanuman. Sire, listen. You might take refuge with Sankara, the best refuge or in a most formidable fort,

had completely lost all hope. Though the princess was late
pacified and carried to the palace, her heart is fully
engrossed in grateful remembrance of the disinterested
rescuer who has disappeared as wonderfully as he
had presented himself. But the king's minister somehow
pursued him unobserved into his Chandala habita-
-tion, the Cheri, but they were unable to unearth
any more information about him. The act ends with
the king's instructions to his minister to probe further
into the mystery surrounding the so-called Chandala
brita. There has also been a talk between the parents
of the princess and the ministers about the princess
proposed marriage with her cousin, either maternal
or paternal; the ministers favour the first naturally
but that king - who is really the king cursed by a
Brahmin to be a chandala with his family for a
year - is living outside their very capital in the Cheri
and it was that very prince - the fact was unknown -
who had wonderfully rescued the princess. Act I ends.

The II act opens with the nurse and the
maid of Kurangi. They have decided that the
princess will resort to excesses and even commit

in the next act when the Vidyādharas are describing the battle for us, we find Rama described as grahaṃ iva bhagaṇeśam (VI.6) and the army of the monkeys is referred to as Hariganapatisainyam. Anybody can understand that the underlined bits in the two contexts Gaṇeśa and Gaṇapati could never refer to the elephant headed God Vināyaka. Etymologically the words refer to the master of the group or gaṇa, in the context, of the monkeys. Obviously, Bhāsa does not seem to anything of this later God.

We now present a small English rendering of two scenes, one in III act and the other in V. In III act, Hanumān has already destroyed the Aśokavana and he has dispatched to Yama-loka successive Rakṣasa hosts sent to punish him by Rāvaṇa. The latter is at his wits' end, when to his joy, news is brought that Indrajit has captured the monkey and is sending it to the Durbar Hall to announce his victory to his father. Rāvaṇa is rather alarmed and is talking to his

would be travelling through the sky in an aerial car, helping those who were separated from their sweet-hearts by presenting them with magic rings. The modern custom of consulting horoscopes before marriages does not seem to have come into vogue as yet and the custom of marrying the maternal or paternal uncle's daughter – prevalent among the Dravidians in South India though prohibited by Bauddhāyana – seems to have been very common then. The curse of a devout Brahmin was believed to be potent enough to effect the change of a Kṣatriya family into a Chandāla and the people were so superstitious and primitively simple as to believe in 'heavenly voices' instructing them at critical junctures.

The first Act opens with the princess Kurangi – for that was the name of the daughter of Kuntibhoja – sporting in a pleasure park. All on a sudden, an elephant attacks the party and the maids manage to make good their escape, leaving the princess to the direct fury of the elephant. At that moment, a young and handsome Chandāla marches right up to the princess, attacks the elephant, receives its charges, pacifies it and rescues her when she

after his talk with Sītā. So he dramatically decides to destroy the Aśokavana so fondly tended and watered with maternal care by Her Majesty Mandodarī's own hands (III.1 exactly as in Śākuntala), abounding in lovely Kokilās, lotuses, well-designed rows of trees, and the cloud-like Trikūṭa peak; this destruction becomes Hanuman's 'visiting card' sent to Rāvaṇa. The other two points relate to the peculiarity of the words used by Bhāsa. In the Act seven after Indrajit's death is announced to his father, mother announcement is also made from behind the curtain and the reference to Rāvaṇa in that context as possessing twenty hands with which he has been victorious over the entire world is as follows: visvalokavijayavikhyātavimśadbāhuśālini bhartari śaṅkeśvare. Here Bhāsa seems to use a peculiar form vimśat and not the usually current form vimśati. Perhaps the form was used in the earlier phase of the language when Bhāsa flourished. Similarly

Avimāraka.

In a city called Vairantya, the mansions in which were mocking at Indra's Amarāvati, there lived a King Kuntibhoja by name, son of Duryodhana (evidently different from the Bhārata epic hero). The people therein were enjoying life to the fullest extent by making their youth 'āmodita' or fully scented (Cf Aśvaghoṣa महान्ति च तु आमोद: गणिका कुचै - Fragments discovered by Luders). Upasnānas or specially designed Baths in which people could spend hours and regale themselves - wrongly described as Turkish Baths now - were fitted up in royal palaces and the palatial mansions of the rich - as described for example in Vātsyāyana's Kāmasūtras. "Ākāśatoya" or artificial shower baths arranged like waterfalls were also fitted up and Kuvangi in a desperate moment rushes there to bathe under one such. Even the ordinary man in the street stealthily made love to his sweetheart and sang away his time happily in her sweet embraces. It was no wonder then that in such an atmosphere a supernatural Vidyādhara

dying. The celestial rivers Gangā and the divine nymphs Urvaśī present themselves to escort the dying hero in a celestial car propelled by a thousand white swans. In his earlier drama, Bhāsa had made Avimāraka declare that dying people visualise some strange visions; in accordance with this social belief of the times, perhaps, Bhāsa made all his dying heroes have such visions just prior to their death and ~~made~~ escorted them ~~escorted~~ to heaven in a celestial car. Duryodhana in the Urubhanga and Daśaratha in the Pratimā also have such visions just before they die. The Kauśītaki Upaniṣad had just then declared that the wise scholar goes to a very different post of 'Brahma' or heaven escorted by nymphs on his death bed. The most striking among such scenes of Bhāsa is the death of Daśaratha in Pratimā II. Another such striking episode is found in a rather suggestive manner, at the end of II act here, where Hanuman seems to be worried as to how best to announce his arrival to Rāma

The incidents in the later 3 acts are practically the same as in the Bhāgavata Purāṇa, with this difference that they are briefer here, and so they need not be summarised here. The drama ends with the fifth act with Kamsa's death and Ugrasena's accession. We believe that this is identical with the Kamsa-vadha referred to by Patañjali as being staged by the Śobhanikas or dramatic troupes of the time; also it might have inspired Puṣyamitra to kill his patron Bṛhadratha in an army melee which is exactly similar to the Dhanurmaha of Kamsa.

It is interesting to note that the portents described for example in the Buddhist scriptures at Buddha's birth are quite similar to those described in the Bālacharita at Śrikrishṇa's birth. The Buddha was called 'mahad bhūtam' exactly as Śrikrishṇa in the Hari Vaṃśa and Bālach. and also in our Viṣṇusahasranāma (प्रो विश्वमहद्भूतं पुरो भूतमनेकधृक् : etc. Buddha's irresistible desire to renounce and serve humanity by showing it a path for universal redemption is similar to Śrī Rama's resolve in the Pratimā कर्तव्यमनुपश्यामि नैवात्र नोपपद्यते ॥ I 24.

Abhisheka. This drama must have been another early production and might have been composed by him to commemorate the accession of his patron Pusyamitra Sunga. The plot is entirely taken from the Ramayana, the Kiskindhā, Sundara and the Yuddha Kandas being summarised in his own lively and original manner. At the end Sri Rama is crowned by the Gods with Dasaratha's permission. At the end of the I act Sugriva is crowned, Vibhisana in IV, and Rama at the end of the last act. It deserved to be noted that all the coronations are celebrated not inside a city, but outside. Bhasa seems to believe that real coronations are those consecrated outside the city filled with all sorts of hypocritical people. Rama's coronation must be celebrated only in 'muni jana vanavāsa', to be enshrined for ever in the hearts of his sincere devotees.

We might note a few interesting items before we translate two typical scenes. On his death bed, Vali performs the ceremonial ācamana or holy sipping of the water thrice and he feels as though he is

eyes like those of a snake, it appears vividly like Anger coming straight from Maheśvara's mouth to the earth. The startled Kaṃsa asks who it is; it replies 'I am Mathūra Rei's curse, Vajrabāhu, comes in the guise of a Chandala, with a garland of skulls, straight from the cemetery to enter into your heart'. Kaṃsa avers that this is a vain boast, but in spite of his protests, it forces an entry along with Alakṣmī, Khalatī, Kālarātrī, Mahāvidrā and Piṅgalākṣī. At this moment, the ejection of the old tenant, Rājaśrī by the new occupant, Curse, is simply bloodcurdling and takes Kaṃsa's breath away. Śrī, rather reluctantly, has to leave her home and depart to Kṛṣṇa's abode, while the Curse starts something like a devil dance with the Chandala girls. With his Virtues departed, Kaṃsa is alarmed when the Curse embraces him, warns him of his impending death and departs. Kaṃsa is now wide awake and demands an explanation from his servants as to why they should have allowed such hideous looking Chandala girls to enter: they swear they have seen none of them. Kaṃsa is worried it might be an evil dream and sends his servant to consult the royal astrologers why in the night quake shocks have rocked the earth, along with violent cyclones and other portents. The servant informs that the Divine Being is now incarnated with a mysterious purpose. Exactly at the moment a servant informs him of the birth of a child to Devaki. Vasudeva reports the birth of a daughter, and requests that she might be spared; Kaṃsa reminds of his previous plighted word; Kaṃsa lifts it to dash it on the rock, but Kātyāyanī,[1] for that is the baby, slips from his hand into the sky, telling him that she is born to destroy his family. Kundodara, Śīta, Nīla, and Manojava, the attendants appear and vanish and the act ends as mysteriously as it started, robbing Kaṃsa's peace of mind away

Devaki worried about the new born baby. Vasudeva takes the child out in the darkness, not knowing what to do and departs somehow pacifying his wife. He finds the guards dead asleep, crosses the flooded Yamuna river which of its own accord becomes easily fordable for him, and proceeds to the sheds of the cowherds nearby where he remembers his old friend Nandagopa was living. It so happens that Nandagopa is also come out exactly at the same time with a still-born baby purporting to bury it before anybody would come to know of it. Vasudeva recognises his friend in the darkness and calls out to him. The latter, though frightened in the beginning, regains his self possession, but is not easily willing to disclose what he is carrying. After a good deal of persuasion, Nandagopa explains to him that his wife was even ignorant of whether she was delivered of a girl or a boy and that he had brought the dead girl away. Vasudeva again prevails upon him to cast aside the dead child. ~~After~~ This, Vasudeva requests Nandagopa to take his child and protect it but Nandagopa who is walking with great difficulty because of the constant fetters to which he was now subjected by Kamsa's orders at Vasudeva's instance a short while ago, at first refuses; but when Vasudeva reminds him of their previous friendship, Nanda readily accepts the child happily and promises to him that he will be very happy amidst the cows in that village. The divine weapons of Krishna, Chakra, Sarnga, Kaumodaki, S'ankha and his Vehicle Garuda pay their obeisance and decide to live incognito as cowherds round about the Divine

Baby. In the meanwhile, Nandagopa has accepted the baby and decided to substitute it in the place of his own which he has cast away on the river bank. After Nandagopa depart, Vasudeva also decides to go back, but hearing the cast off baby crying, is startled in the beginning, but soon reassures himself: he is happy at the prospect of being able to deceive Kamsa saying that this girl was just then born to Devaki and with the child, he comes back to the place where his wife has delivered and gives it to his wife. Act I ends then in the Bhagavata Vasudeva and Nandagopa do not meet & the baby is exchanged quickly when the [illegible] are all asleep

The II act starts with a unique blood curdling vision, the like of which is perhaps difficult to be met with even in Shakespeare. Kamsa's sleep is disturbed as a result of a weakness in his bedroom by some Chandāla girls who straightaway ask him to marry them. 'What does this earthquake betoken? either good or evil?' Kamsa is reflecting within himself when the girls again alarm him with their strange request. He wonders how these girls might have let themselves in. But the girls will not allow him any rest, they continue their request and Kamsa, who was so far dealing death and creating fright even to Yama and others, are now causing him the deepest alarm. He thinks a great weight is lifted off his mind when these girls vanish as strangely as they have come. But a more frightful thing, Curse embodied, appears before him under orders from the Supreme Creation controller, Vishṇu. Heap of black collyrium, torch in hand, with frightful fangs and mouth, with tawny

Here in Verse 4 - स्त्रीरत्नं दुर्लभं लोके शिवा वैवस्वतं कुलं, the word शिवा cannot obviously refer to the goddess Śivā but to a temple and anybody can see that it was written long before the temple was built.

Part II.

Summaries of Bhasa's dramas.

Bālacharita. (*) Foot note to the word Kartyayani (next page

[The word Kātyāyanī is always written and pronounced as Kārtyāyinī in Malabar. A com. on the Durgāsaptaśati derives this peculiar word with an extra 'r' before t + final ini instead of ani. The Pañcikā on the Amarakośa (which must be more than 400 years old since the mss in the Adyar Library bears the date 1574 A.D. - See Adyar Library Bulletin Vol IV. Pt 1. Feb 41) writes the word also in this way when commenting on उमा कात्यायनीगौरी. Rāma Vāriyar too gives Kārtyāyinī as an alternative for कात्यायनी + curiously rejects both as devoid of sanction. So it looks as though the form Kartyayini which Bhāsa alone uses may have been a Malayalee mannerism; similarly the word प्रतिमा is always written by Bhasa as प्रतिमा, again another Malabar mannerism]. Footnote to be added at foot of page 4 where Kārtyāyanī occurs - here next page.

Balacharitā. The story of the Balacharitā is naturally that of Śrī Krishna as a boy, ending with his killing Kamsa. With minor variations in respect of one or two episodes, the story is practically the same as the one in (giving outline) on Bhagavata purāṇa. X Skandha purvārdha ending with Kamsavadha in 44th chapter.

After the exit of the Sutradhāra, Nārada enters the stage and informs the audience about the birth of the divine baby. He also goes and the act proper starts with

Page 51 of part I to be retyped.

Sanskrit classics by M. Hiriyanna
Kuppuswamy Agrahara - Rs 60

आ नो भद्राः क्रतवो यन्तु विश्वतः

Let good thoughts come to us from everywhere
Rg-Veda I. 89. 1

Bhāsa's dramas - II.

Ideals of Ancient Indian Education by Dr A.S. Altekar.
Indian Book Shop, Benares.

U. Venkatakrishna Rao

Professor of Samskrit,

Madras Christian College,

Tambaram.

What care we for the praise of him who lauds
In ignorance of where our merit lies?
What painter values at a rust applause,
However loud from him that lacketh eyes?
Nay, blame itself we'd rather choose to hear,
If that the judge discerns the faults he shows;
and censure pleases the judicious more
than floods of flattery from fools like those.